

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

58

---

VOL. VI. NEW SERIES.

---

JANUARY—APRIL,

MDCCCLXVI.

PUBLIC LIBRARY,

LIBR. MICH.

SEP 17 1888

LONDON:

BURNS, LAMBERT, & OATES, 17 PORTMAN STREET,

AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.

DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.

1866.

COX AND WYMAN,  
ORIENTAL, CLASSICAL, AND GENERAL PRINTERS,  
GREAT QUEEN STREET, W.C.



# CONTENTS.—No. XI.

ART.	PAGE
I. CALIFORNIA AND THE CHURCH.....	1
The Resources of California. By John S. Hittel. San Francisco.	
Christian Missions. By T. W. M. Marshall. Longmans.	
II. THE VICEROYS OF IRELAND .....	36
History of the Viceroys of Ireland ; with Notices of the Castle of Dublin and its chief Occupants in Former Times. By J. T. Gilbert, Esq. Dublin : Duffy. 1865.	
III. THE FOUNDRRESS OF THE FAITHFUL COMPANIONS OF JESUS	59
Vie de Madame de Bonnault d'Houet, Fondatrice de la Société des Fidèles Compagnes de Jésus. Par l'Abbé F. Martin, Missionn. Apost. Chan. Hon. de Belley.	
IV. CATHOLIC INSTINCTS .....	78
Popery Ancient and Modern : its Spirit, Principles, Character, Objects, Prospects, Checks, and Extirpation ; with Warnings and Counsels to the People of England. By John Campbell, D.D. 1865. John Snow, 35, Paternoster Row.	
V. CROMWELL'S CONQUEST AND SETTLEMENT OF IRELAND ...	107
The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland. By John P. Prendergast, Esq. London : Longmans.	
VI. THE PAPAL ALLOCUTION ON FREEMASONRY .....	137
1. Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobinism. A Translation from the French of the Abbé Barruch. London. 1797.	
2. Proofs of a Conspiracy against all the Religions and Governments of Europe, carried on in the Secret Meetings of Freemasons, Illuminate, and Reading Societies. Collected from good authorities by John Robison, A.M. Third Edition. London. 1798.	
3. Der Freimaurer-Orden in seiner wahren Bedeutung. E. E. Eckert. Dresden. 1852.	
4. Kann ein gläubiger Christ Freimaurer sein ? Antwort an den Herrn Dr. Rudolph Sezder, von Wilhelm Emmanuel, Freiherrn von Ketteler, Bischof von Mainz. Fünfte Auflage. Mainz : Franz Kirchheim. 1865,	

ART.	PAGE
VII. THE NEW PARLIAMENT .....	177
The Shilling House of Commons for 1866. London : Hardwicke.	
Dod's Parliamentary Companion for 1866. London : Whitaker & Co.	
VIII. DR. PUSEY'S APOLOGY FOR ANGLICANISM.....	188
The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England. A Letter to Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. By Henry Edward Manning, D.D. London : Longmans.	
The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost ; or, Reason and Revelation. By Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster. London : Longmans.	
The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church. By Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. London : J. H. and J. Parker.	
IX. LETTER TO DR. PUSEY BY MR. ALLIES .....	239
X. APPENDIX TO THE OCTOBER ARTICLE ON GALILEO.....	260
XI. NOTICES OF BOOKS .....	268
F. Perrone's <i>Prelectiones Theologicæ</i> —Mr. Butt on National Education—Mr. Badeley on the Seal of Con- fession—Mr. Oxenham on Dishonest Criticism—The "Union Review"—Mr. Barrow's <i>Valley of Tears</i> —Life of S. Teresa —The Month—Mr. Dyer's <i>History of Rome</i> —Mr. Rawlin- son's <i>Ancient Monarchies</i> —Mr. Smiles's <i>Lives of Boulton     and Watt, &amp;c., &amp;c.</i>	

## CONTENTS.—No. XII.

ART.	PAGE
I. ROME THE CIVILIZER OF NATIONS .....	297
1. Le Parfum de Rome. Par Louis Veillot. 3me edition. Paris : Gaume Frères. 1862.	
2. Rome et la Civilisation. Par Eugene Mahon de Monaghan. Paris. Charles Douniol. 1863.	
II. CATHOLICISM RESTORED IN GENEVA .....	325
Histoire de M. Vuarin et du Rétablissement du Catholicisme à Genève. Par M. l'Abbé F. Marten, Miss Ap. et M. l'Abbé Fleury. Paris. Tobra et Haton. 1862.	
III. CHRISTIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY .....	348
De la Richesse dans les Sociétés Chrétiennes. Par Charles Perin, Professeur de Droit Public et d'Economie Politique à l'Université de Louvain. 2 vols. 8vo. J. Lecoffre et Guil- laumin. Paris : 1861.	
IV. THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS OF ALEXANDRIA.—ORIGEN .....	377
Origenis Opera Omnia, Ed. De la Rue, accurate J. P. Migne. Parisiis.	
S. Gregorii Thaumaturgi Oratio Panegyrica in Origenem (Opera Omnia), accurate J. P. Migne. Parisiis.	
V. DR. PUSEY'S PROJECT OF UNION .....	412
The Reunion of Christendom. A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy. By Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster. London : Longman.	
An Eirenicon. By E. B. Pusey, D.D. Oxford : Parker.	
The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work, Reviewed in a Letter addressed (by permission) to the Most Rev. H. E. Manning, D.D. By the Very Rev. Frederick Oakeley, M.A. London : Longmans.	
Letter to the <i>Weekly Register</i> of Nov. 25, 1865, signed E. B. Pusey.	
VI. CHAMPAGNY'S ROMAN EMPIRE .....	449
Les Césars. Par le Comte Franz de Champagny. Paris : Ambroise Bray.	

ART.	PAGE
Rome et la Judée au Temps de la Chute de Néron (ans 66-72 après Jésus Christ). Par le Comte F. de Champagny. Les Antonins ans de Jésus Christ 69-180. Par le Comte De Champagny.	
VII. SIGNS OF AN IRISH POLICY .....	485
Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.	
VIII. THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE .....	496
Acta Concilii Florentini. The History of the Council of Florence. Translated from the Russian by Basil Popoff. Edited by the Rev. J. M. Neale, D.D. London : Masters.	
IX. NOTICES OF BOOKS .....	542
The Bishop of Birmingham on the Management of Prisoners —Dr. Newman's Letters to Dr. Pusey—F. Gallwey's Sermon, "The Lady Chapel"—Mr. Allies on Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church—"Anglo-Romanism Unveiled"—The <i>Union Review</i> — Dr. Melia on Auricular Confession—F. Faber's Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects—Fitzgerald v. Northcote— Missionary College, chiefly for Pagan Nations.	
X. FOREIGN EVENTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST .....	561
XI. CORRESPONDENCE .....	589

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1866.

---

ART. I.—CALIFORNIA AND THE CHURCH.

1. *The Resources of California.* By JOHN S. HITTEL. San Francisco.
2. *Christian Missions.* By T. W. M. MARSHALL. Longmans.

THE year 1769 will long be memorable in the annals of the world, as the date of the birth of the Emperor Napoleon and of the Duke of Wellington. In the same year another event took place of small significance according to the thoughts of this world, but which in the next world was assuredly regarded of infinitely greater importance; for this was the year in which a poor despised Franciscan friar, the Father Junipero Serra, entered into California Alta, the first apostle of a land, which has since, for such different reasons, become so famous.

He was an Italian by birth, but had resided for many years in Mexico, where he had preached the Gospel with great success among the heathen Indian population. A man of singular faith and piety, he lived the severest life, considering with his Father S. Francis, that poverty and suffering are keys wherewith the zealous missionary is certain to be able to unlock the floodgates of grace, which divide Heaven from earth. He used to carry a stone with him, with which, like S. Jerome, he would beat his breast for his sins, and he endeavoured to bring home to the mind of his uncivilized hearers the malice of sin, by scourging his innocent body till streams of blood flowed forth in their presence, by severe fasts, long prayers, and night watchings. He seldom rode on mule or horseback, but preferred to journey humbly on foot. Shortly after his arrival in Mexico, his leg was attacked with a grievous sore; still he gave himself no rest, but was constant in journeying and preaching. While he was labouring like an apostle among the Mexicans, the Spanish monarch ordered D. Jose de Galvez (who became later Minister-General for all the Indies) to form an expedition from La Paz into Upper Cali-

foria.\* Whatever may be said of the rapacious cruelty of many of the Spanish governors and colonizers in America, the Government at home was animated, on the whole, with the most Catholic and loyal intentions. Its instructions and public documents were conceived in the most Christian sense; and if they were not always carried out in the same spirit, this arose from its inability to control subjects at an immense distance from the seat of Government, and surrounded by exciting temptations and pressing dangers. The following words were addressed by one of the Spanish monarchs to the Indies:—"The kings our progenitors, from the discovery of the West Indies, its islands and continents, commanded our captains, officers, discoverers, colonizers, and all other persons, that on arriving at these provinces, they should by means of interpreters cause to be made known to the Indians, that they were sent to teach them good customs, to lead them from vicious habits, and from the eating of human flesh, to instruct them in our Holy Catholic faith, to preach to them salvation, and to attract them to our dominion." The same Catholic and religious spirit animates every part of the great codex of Indian laws, which were promulgated by successive kings in that most Catholic country.

Though it often did happen that local governors were not ministers of this Catholic spirit, but rather of their own rapacity and cruelty, this was not always the case, and we have before us an instance. When Galvez set forth on his expedition to conquer California, the first article of the instructions which he drew up, for the guidance of all who were with him, ran in these terms:—"The first object of the expedition is to establish the Catholic religion among a numerous heathen people, submerged in the obscure darkness of paganism, and to extend the dominion of our Lord the King, and to protect this peninsula from the ambitious views of foreign nations." Nor were these mere words, written to salve a conscience or blind a critical public, as we shall now see: for he took Father Junipero, who was zealous for the salvation of souls, into his counsels; and the priest and the layman worked jointly together. Two small vessels, the *San Carlos* and *San Antonio*, were freighted to go by sea. Señor Galvez details with a charming simplicity how he assisted Father Junipero to pack the sacred vestments and other church furniture, and declared that he was a better sacristan

---

\* As far back as 1697, the Jesuits had, with apostolic zeal, founded many missions in Lower California; they never, however, had pushed up into California Alta.

than the Father, for he had packed his share of the ornaments first, and had to go and help the Father. Moreover, in order that the new missions might be established with the same success as those which had been already founded by F. Junipero, in Sierra Gorda, Galvez ordered to be packed up and embarked all kinds of household and field utensils, iron implements for agricultural labour, all kinds of seeds from Old and New Spain, garden herbs for food, and flowers for the decoration of the altars. Then he sent on by land two hundred head of cattle to stock the country, so that there might be food to eat and beasts to labour on the land.

F. Junipero placed the whole enterprise under the patronage of the Most Holy Patriarch S. Joseph, to whom he dedicated the country. He blessed the vessels and sent on board of them three Fathers, who should accompany Galvez and his men. Two other parties were formed by land, which were to meet the ships on the coast far up the country; and all started, except Father Junipero, who was delayed some time by the season of Lent and by his spiritual duties. When he overtook the convoy, his leg and foot were so inflamed, that he was hardly able to get on or off his mule. The Fathers and their companions wished to send him back: they thought he was not equal to the undertaking. But he had faith that our Lord would carry him through. He called a muleteer and said to him:—"My son, don't you know some remedy for the sore on my foot and leg?" But the muleteer answered:—"Father, what remedy can I know? Am I a surgeon? I am a muleteer, and have only cured the sore backs of beasts." "Then consider me a beast," said the Father, "and this sore, which has produced the swelling on my legs and prevents me by its pain from standing or sleeping, to be a sore on a beast, and give me the treatment you would apply to a beast." The muleteer replied, smiling, "I will, Father, to please you;" and taking a small piece of tallow, mashed it between two stones with some herbs, heated it over the fire, and then anointed the foot and leg, and left a plaster on the sore. The Father slept that night, awoke in health and spirits, and astonished the whole party by rising early to say Matins and Lauds and then Mass, and proceeded on the journey quite restored. After forty-six days' travelling by land, they reached the port of San Diego; and F. Junipero now established his first mission. He then went on to the place since called San Francisco, and established there another mission. They fell short of provisions and supplies, the *San Antonio*, which had long been due, did not arrive, and Portalá, the governor of the expedition, determined to abandon the mission, if they

were not relieved by the 20th of March; but on the Feast of S. Joseph the ship hove into view, bringing an abundance of provisions, and the mission was then firmly established.

The usual way of erecting a mission was as follows: the locality was taken possession of in the name of Spain by the lay authority; a tent or an adobe building was erected as the temporary chapel; the Fathers, in procession, proceeded to bless the place and the chapel, on whose front a crucifix, or a simple wooden cross, was raised; the Holy Sacrifice was then offered up, and a sermon was preached on the coming and power of the Holy Ghost. The *Veni Creator* was sung, and a Father was charged with the direction and responsibility of the mission.

The Indians were attracted by little presents. To the men and women were given pieces of cloth, or food, and to the children bits of sugar. They would soon gather round the missionaries when they found how good and kind they were, and the missionaries were not slow in picking up the language. They became the fathers and instructors of the poor ignorant Indians, catechized them in the mysteries of the faith, collected them into villages round the mission church, and taught them to plough and cultivate the land, to sow wheat, to grind corn, to bake; they introduced the use of the olive, the vine, and the apple; they showed them how to yoke the oxen for work, how to weave and spin cloth for clothing, to prepare leather from the hides, and taught them the rudiments of commerce.

There was another feature in the mode followed by the Spaniards in preaching the Gospel, which is worthy of mention, and which shows how Spain recognized the independent action of the Church and her own duty to lend her every assistance and protection she might need. A Presidio was established, in which the secular governor, with a small number of officers, soldiers, and officials, resided. These represented the majesty of the King of Spain, and served, in case of need, for protection and order. At some distance from the Presidio and independent of it, was formed the mission, a large convent for the friars and for hospitality, and a church, built of "adobe," or mud walls, sometimes seven or eight feet in thickness. The land in the surrounding neighbourhood was assigned to the missions for the support of the Indians. In fact, the whole economy and arrangements, both of presidios and missions, were made subservient to the wants of civilization and religion, which were introduced among the native population. This system remained in full force, consulting simply the benefit of the poor Indian, till the Liberal Cortes, in 1813, overturned the



design of the Spanish monarchs, and began to introduce the idea of colonization and usurpation. Up to this time the Church had had full action upon the people, and what she wrought in the span of forty years was little less than miraculous. The Indians felt that they had been lifted out of their state of abject misery and ignorance, and that the strangers who had come among them had come simply from disinterested charity, for their temporal and eternal welfare. They felt that life was made to them less a burden, and that a way was opened out for them to endless happiness beyond the grave. De Courcy, in his "Catholic Church in the United States," assures us that the Fathers converted, within the few years they had control of the Californian missions, no less than 75,000 Indians, for whom they also provided food, clothing, and instruction. The system of colonization, brought in by the Spanish Liberals in 1813, was an evil, but it was a mere prelude to the confiscation of the Indian property which was perpetrated by the Liberal Mexican Government in 1833. It was pretended that the friars were unequal to the management of the missions, and the natives' property was therefore transferred to the hands of laymen. Mr. Marshall, in his interesting work on "Christian Missions," quotes the following statistics, comparing the two conditions :—

	Under the Administration of the Friars.		Under the Civil Administration.
Christian Indians.....	30,650	...	4,450
Horned cattle .....	424,000	...	28,220
Horses and mules ...	62,000	...	3,800
Sheep .....	321,500	...	31,600
Cereal crops .....	70,000	...	4,000

And then he sums up in these words :—

It appears, then, that in the brief space of eight years the secular administration, which affected to be a protest against the inefficiency of the ecclesiastical, had not only destroyed innumerable lives, replunged a whole province into barbarism, and almost annihilated religion and civilization, but had so utterly failed even in that special aim which it professed to have most at heart,—the development of material prosperity,—that it had already reduced the wealth of a single district in the following notable proportions. Of horned cattle there remained about *one fifteenth* of the number possessed under the religious administration ; of horses and mules less than *one sixteenth* ; of sheep about *one tenth* ; and of cultivated land producing cereal crops less than *one seventeenth*. It is not to the Christian, who will mourn rather over the moral ruin which accompanied the change, that such facts chiefly appeal ; but the merchant and the civil magistrate, however indifferent to the interests of religion and morality, will keenly appreciate the cruel and blundering

policy of which these are the admitted results, and will perhaps be inclined to exclaim with Mr. Möllhausen, "It is impossible not to wish that the Missions were flourishing once more!"\*

How beautiful was the old Spanish system under which Father Junipero and his companions set forth to reclaim and convert the wandering Indian! Is it not the greatest glory of Spain that she can still cheer our dark horizon by the light of her past history, and shed a fragrance which remains for ever over lands which have been broken down by the hoof of the invader, and desolated by his diabolical pride and insatiable rapacity? What was the Spanish system as exhibited in California? It was simply this: a recognition without question or jealousy, that our Lord, the great High Priest, continues in His priesthood to be the Shepherd, Teacher, and Minister of His people. "To go and teach all nations," "to minister to the least of the little ones," to be the "shepherd of the flock," "to lay down life for the flock." This is distinctly the operation of Christ through His priests. That this was the real character of the Christian priesthood was a clear and elementary principle, which admitted of no doubt in the mind of the Spanish people.

Conscious of their power, and with a light burning within them which shone over the vast prospects that lay before them, of extending the faith and saving innumerable souls, for whom the most Precious Blood had been shed, the Spanish missionaries went forth to extend their conquests over the heathen world. Rapine and plunder were not their aim, they were introduced among colonizers by the snare of the devil. To maintain the Indian on his territory, to raise, instruct, and christianize him, giving him rights and equality before the law, this was the policy of Catholic Spain. The priest, therefore, was regarded as the chief pioneer, his plans were recognized and acted upon, and he was considered to be not a mere creature of the Crown, who should extend its influence, but a minister and agent of His Majesty the Great King of Heaven, who had deigned, in His infinite love, to look upon Spain with a peculiar predilection, and to choose her as an instrument to save the souls for whom He once had died.

A hundred years ago no European had ever fixed his abode in California Alta. Father Junipero and his devoted companions, led on by zeal "to establish the Catholic religion among a numerous heathen people, submerged in the obscure darkness of paganism," were, then, the real pioneers of Cali-

---

\* Vol. ii., p. 257.

fornia. Three Protestant writers, quoted by Mr. Marshall, shall sum up for us in a few words the civilizing effects of the Catholic education of the Indians in California. Captain Morrell says :—

The Indians are very industrious in their labours, and obedient to their teachers and directors, to whom they look up as fathers and protectors, and who, in return, discharge their duty towards these poor Indians with a great deal of feeling and humanity. They are generally well clothed and fed, have houses of their own, and are made as comfortable as they can wish to be. The greatest care is taken of any who are affected with any disease, and every attention is paid to their wants.\*

And Mr. Forbes writes :—

The best and most unequivocal proof of the good conduct of the Franciscan Fathers is to be found in the unbounded affection and devotion invariably shown to them by their Indian subjects. They venerate them, not merely as Fathers and friends, but with a degree of devotedness approaching to adoration.†

And, lastly, Mr. Bartlett observes :—

They (the Indians) are represented to have been sober and industrious, well clothed and fed. . . . They constituted a large family, of which the Padres were the social, religious, and, we might almost say, political heads.‡

Such was the first planting in this vineyard of the Lord. Let us briefly note the blight and destruction which followed. In 1827, a Mr. Smith established himself in California to make money. In 1834, three hundred Americans settled in the country for the same purpose. In 1839, Captain Sutter built a fort and an American refuge. In 1841, he got possession of a considerable tract of land. In 1844, a revolution took place, and the American settlers sold themselves for a grant of land to the party which was afterwards defeated.

In 1845, the people, being harassed by civil war, wished for the protection of some strong external government. It was a chance whether California was to become English or United States territory. H.M.S. *Collingwood* entered the port, we, believe, of Monterey, and was asked to set up the Union Jack, and declare the country to be under British protection. The captain replied that he would sail up the coast and ascertain whether this was the will of the country, and if it were, he would return and declare the protectorate. Meanwhile, the United States ship *Savannah*, under Commodore Stoa, was on the watch ; so that when the *Colling-*

\* Christian Missions, vol. ii., p. 252.

† P. 251.

‡ P. 253.

wood returned, having ascertained the good will of the other ports, she found, to her surprise and dismay, that she had been outstripped by the Yankee, and that the Stars and Stripes were floating over the town. California from that time became the property of the United States. In 1848, gold was accidentally discovered, and an emigration set in with the violence of a spring tide, of a very different character to that of the pious Señor Galvez, or of the humble Father Junipero and his Franciscans.

Then, indeed, the world began to ring with glad tidings of great joy: the sun had at last arisen on a benighted land—its redemption was at hand. Every newspaper in Europe—we may say in the world—teemed with reports of a new *El Dorado* discovered on the western coast of America. This country was California. Adventurous spirits, athirst for wealth, from all parts of the world, were set in motion towards this land of promise. Ships were chartered and freighted with men and youths ready to spend all they had, in order only to reach the golden bourne. Merchants from the United States and from Europe, ready speculators, sent out their vessels laden to the water's edge with dry goods, hardware, corn, spirits, and general merchandise. The excitement and the recklessness were perhaps without a parallel. Ships reached the great and beautiful bay of San Francisco, in which all the fleets of the world could ride at ease, and were often abandoned by their captain and crews, who scampered off to the gold diggings, even before their cargo was discharged. Sometimes they fell to pieces in the bay; sometimes they became the property of adventurers, or were run aground, and served as temporary houses, and then as the corners and foundations of streets, which energetic speculators soon carried down upon piles into the water. There they stand to this day, monuments of the *auri sacra fames*.

It was, indeed, natural that none but the fiercest and most daring elements should prevail. The modest, the timid, the indolent, the sickly, the child, the woman, the aged, the leisure-learned, the owner of property, of good position, of fair prospects, the man of routine, the unambitious, were all left behind. It was said, and said truly, in the cities of Europe, America, and Australia, that men of desperate character were on the road to California; that all went armed with knives and revolvers; that the way thither was a highway of rapine and crime; and that none should start who were not prepared to fight it out any day in self-defence or in attack. There were a thousand difficulties arising from the immense length of the journey, and from the great

numbers on the way; and a thousand other difficulties to be accepted on arrival in the country—expense, danger, uncertainty, perhaps sickness; and all these far away from home. Such were the prospects in those days, and such the normal condition of life in California.

It is not strange, then, that the men who formed the horde which, fifteen or sixteen years ago, began to flow into California, should represent to us a type of all that is rough, adventurous, devil-may-care, elastic, light-hearted, and determined in human nature. The Australian population began with convicts and honest emigrants. The Californian population began with all kinds of unconvicted criminals from all parts of the world, with "Sydney ducks," as they called the ticket-of-leave men from New South Wales or Tasmania; but, besides these, a considerable number of energetic, honest emigrants, chiefly from Europe and the States. Then, we may add, that the Yankee element prevails in the Californian population, and the John Bull element in the Australian. The American is lean, and all nerve and impatient energy; health and life are to him of no moment when he sees an object to be attained by the risk of them. If we may be allowed to put it grotesquely, his body is human, but his soul is a high-pressure steam-engine; he knows no delay and is reckless, and his bye-word is "Go ahead." The Englishman, by contrast, is fat and easy-going; much more cautious of health and life, he calculates on both. F. Strickland (Catholic Missions in Southern India) happily applies to him the words of Holy Writ spoken of the Romans, "*Possederunt omnem terram consilio suo et patientia.*" "It is by wisdom in council, and by patiently watching their opportunity . . . wisdom which has often degenerated into Machiavellism, but has never neglected a single opportunity of aggrandisement; patience which has known how to 'bide its time,' and to avoid precipitation"—this is how the Englishman succeeds. And so to look at the Englishman in a Pickwickian sense, he is a matter-of-fact, cautious gentleman, who wishes to make very sure of what he has got, and when he feels comfortably confident, says "All right," and moves on deliberately to acquire more. An English traveller says:—

The first night we arrived in San Francisco, we were kept awake all night on board the steamer by the incessant cry of "Go ahead," which accompanied the launch from the crane which sent each article of luggage and goods on to the wharf. It reminded us of a story his late Eminence Cardinal Wiseman used to tell. He said, the first Italian words he heard on first landing, some forty years ago or more, in Italy from England, were,

"Pazienza, pazienza." The Englishman sums up all things that happen with the words "All right;" the Yankee with the words, "Go ahead."

Many merchants realized enormous fortunes in a few months—some even by one consignment; but many were hit hard, and many were ruined. A period in which an egg was worth a dollar was followed by a glut in the market of all kinds of goods and provisions. There was nobody to receive them; there was no sale for them. Warehousing cost more than the total value of goods and freight. Tons of sea-bread were abandoned; barrels of hams and bacon, cargoes of cheeses, dry goods, and even wine and spirits were left unclaimed, and fell into the hands of "smart" men of business, or were spoiled by weather and neglect. Ships, captains, crews, and cargoes bound to California, sailed as into a vortex, and were lost in the whirlpool of excitement. Even officers of men-of-war were seized by the gold mania, and "ran" to soil their white hands in the precious "pay-dirt."

Such circumstances as these, which occurred in 1849-50-51, are now past, and can never recur, at least in California. The country is settling down into a normal condition. The regular system of American States Government is permanently established. On two occasions, once in 1851 and again in 1856, when the Government of San Francisco fell into the hands of a set of low sharpers, who suspended the laws for punishment of crime and protected criminals, the people, trained from childhood to self-government, extemporized what was called a Vigilance Committee. They abrogated for the time the States' laws, and set at nought the authority of the Federal government in Washington until order was re-established; they caught thieves, tried them in the night, and hung them in the morning. They struck terror into the "Sydney ducks," and into the plunderers who had come down upon San Francisco, like vultures upon their prey, from all countries of the world. When the committee had effected its object it peaceably dissolved, and the regular form of government resumed its sway. California, however, still presents a spectacle unlike that of any other country of the world. Sydney, Melbourne, and Queensland have not the diversity of population which California has. They are more like "home;" a stronger government is exercised; there is more security, less excitement, less incident, and less variety in life. The traveller meets every day, in the diggings and elsewhere, men who had come over from Australia, thinking to better themselves; they have not done so, and they all complain that they have not found the same order and



security for man and property ; and most of them determine to return in the coming season.

For internal resources, in scenery and climate, and in variety of production, California is probably superior to the Australian colonies. There is a continual excitement, and all the business of the country is done in San Francisco ; it is the only port of any note ; the trade with California from the States, from South America, from Europe, Asia, and Australia, is to San Francisco. She is called the "Queen of the Pacific," and it is expected that she will become one of the largest cities of the world, and that the whole trade between China, Japan, and Europe and the States will pass through her. She will be one of the great ports, and the most magnificent harbour on the high-road which, when the railroad across the plains is completed, will connect together in one line Pekin, Canton, Japan, San Francisco, New York, London, and St. Petersburg ; thus girdling in a great highway the northern hemisphere of the world. The market in San Francisco is just large and manageable enough to produce the greatest amount of excitement for the merchants. Exports and imports are reckoned at about eleven million pounds each ; of the exports about eight millions are of gold and silver. The highest game is played, and the English houses, always safe and sure, are looked upon as slow and plodding in comparison with the American. The stakes are, day by day, fortune or ruin. The interest on loans varies from one to ten per cent. a month, according to the security. There are great losses and great gains. San Francisco is in a chronic state of exciting business fermentation ; there is little amusement, no learned leisure, but everybody is occupied in trade or speculation. The people are well dressed—all the men wear broadcloth, nearly all the women silk ; there are no beggars in the streets, and there is an air of healthiness, vigour, and buoyancy of life such as is not to be seen in any other city in Europe or America. No market in the world, save, perhaps, that of London, is better supplied. Railroads run along the streets in all directions. Churches, schools, hotels, and houses are lifted up from their foundations by hydraulic power ; and if the owners wish to add a storey, instead of clapping it on above, they build it in below, and roof, walls, and floors, all go up together uninjured.

The traveller is astonished to see a procession of solid-built houses slowly marching through the centre of one of the principal thoroughfares. In eight-and-forty hours an hotel, brick built and three stories high, will be carried, without interruption to business, from one part of the city to

another. The country is full of interesting incident and novel excitement. It contains all the precious metals, gold, silver, platinum, copper, iron, coal, asphaltum, spring and mineral oil, borax, arsenic, cobalt. The largest crops in the world have been grown on its soil. We quote the published accounts:—*Crops of 80 bushels of wheat to the acre have been grown in California. Mr. Hill harvested 82½ bushels from an acre in Pajaro Valley in 1853, and obtained 660 bushels from ten acres. In 1851, Mr. P. M. Scooffy harvested 88 bushels, and Mr. N. Carriger 80 bushels, in Sorroma Valley. Again: In 1853 a field of 100 acres in the valley of the Pajaro produced 90,000 bushels of barley, and one acre of it yielded 149 bushels. It was grown by Mr. J. B. Hill, and was mentioned as undoubtedly true by the assessor of Monterey County in his official report; and a prize was granted by an agricultural society for the crop. According to the assessor's report, the average crop of potatoes in Sacramento country in 1860 was 390 bushels per acre. Potatoes have been seen in the market weighing 7 lb. The largest beet-root was 5 ft. long, 1 ft. thick, and 118 lb. in weight—it was three years old; cabbages 45 lb. and 53 lb. each; and a squash vine bore at a time 1,600 lb. of fruit. Then the largest trees in the world are found in California, in mammoth-tree groves. Two are known to be 32 ft. in diameter, 325 ft. high. "One of the trees which is down must have been 450 ft. high, and 40 ft. in diameter." The tree of which the bark was stripped for 116 ft., and sent to the Crystal Palace, continued green and flourishing two years and a half after being thus denuded.\* The highest waterfall in the world is in the Yosemite Valley, in California. It is 2,063 ft. high, according to the official surveyor. The Californian Geysers are among the wonders of the world—a multitude of boiling springs, emitting large quantities of steam with a hissing, roaring, spluttering noise; while near them, within a few feet, are deliciously cold springs. There are mud volcanoes, which can be heard ten miles off, and seen at a still greater distance. A great variety of wild beasts and birds—bears, panthers, wolves, deer, elk, the Californian vulture (next to the condor the largest bird that flies), make up other sources of interest, speculation, and excitement, and contribute to give to Californians a certain peculiar character and sympathy one with another, which unite them together as hail-fellows-well-met in any part of the world in which they may chance to meet. Our*

---

\* It is said that it has since thrown out fresh bark, but the rumour wants confirmation.



space will not allow us to speak of the mining life. It has, however, been made sufficiently familiar to our readers by the numerous accounts which have reached us of the Australian mines and diggings. We may only add to these the fact that there is somewhat less order and a greater chance of loss of property, limb, and life, in California than in Australia, owing to the different forms of government and traditions of the two countries.

Finally, a brief allusion to the mode of conveyance through the country. There is travelling up the rivers in steamboats three and four stories high, which not unfrequently blow up or run into each other (we have read of three destroyed within as many weeks, and not very much was thought of it except by the shareholders, who soon recovered their equanimity).\* A considerable portion of the country can be traversed in waggons called "stages," whose springs are so very strong that ocular demonstration is necessary as a proof of their existence. They cross plains and mountains, penetrate forests, and skirt precipices, along the most difficult roads. Wooden bridges thrown across ravines or deep gullies or streams, and formed by laying down a number of scantling poles, and covering them with loose planks, are taken by the four-horse "stage" at a gallop, just as you ride at a ditch or a rasper out hunting; patter, patter go the horses' feet, up and down go the loose planks—one's heart in one's mouth—no horses have slipped through—no broken legs—it seems a miracle—and away onwards goes the stage, conducted by dauntless and skilful drivers, to the everlasting cry of "go ahead!" But much of the country must be travelled on horseback, and California has an admirable breed of thin, wiry little horses, which will gallop with their rider over a hundred miles a day, requiring little care and hardly any food. Much of the country is still unexplored. There are mountains covered with perpetual snow, and immense virgin pine forests covering their sides; long rolling plains, baked by the sun; and rich luxuriant valleys, watered by the richest fish-streams. In extent the country is 189,000 square miles, or nearly four times larger than England, and possesses within itself all the resources of the temperate and tropical zones. There are 40,000,000 acres of arable land in the State, though not more than 1,000,000 are now in cultivation.

---

\* These great steamers have excellent appointments, and every comfort and luxury. They carry the clergy always at half price. The same courtesy and consideration is often shown in America.

The climate near the ocean is the most equable in the world. At San Francisco there is a difference of only seven degrees between the mean temperature of winter and summer—the average of the latter being 57°, and of the former 50° Fahrenheit. Ice and snow are never seen in winter, and in summer the weather is so cool that woollen clothing may be worn every day. There are not more than a dozen days in the year too warm for comfort at mid-day, and the oldest inhabitant cannot remember a night when blankets were not necessary for comfortable sleep. The climate is just of that character most favourable to the constant mental and physical activity of men, and to the unvarying health and continuous growth of animals and plants. By travelling a few hundred miles the Californian may find any temperature he may desire—great warmth in winter, and icy coldness in summer.

It may be understood, then, from all these circumstances, that the blood of a Californian tingles with an excitement of its own. Indeed it is constantly observed that men who leave California with their fortunes made and with the intention of establishing themselves in the Eastern States, or in Europe, are unable to settle down, and soon return through the Golden Gates.

Let us now proceed with the subject before us, and draw out briefly two contrasts : one between the Spanish or Catholic and the Anglo-Saxon or non-Catholic conduct and policy towards the original lords of the soil, the Indians ; the other as between the names they gave to the localities which were the scenes of their respective labours. It will indicate a difference of tone and spirit sufficiently remarkable.

Of course all Californians are not to be held responsible for the acts of a low and heartless section of ruffians, any more than all Englishmen are accountable for the atrocities which we have perpetrated in times past in India or Oceanica. But as we would not pass over the crimes committed by the Anglo-Saxon race in India, were India our topic, so neither will we be silent here on deeds of equal atrocity with any of which we were guilty, committed in these latter days by some of the new occupiers of California.

The love of souls and the love of wealth do not, indeed, grow in the same heart. We have already faintly sketched the result of the Church's love of souls on the temporal and spiritual well-being of the indigenous population of California. Under her gentle care was realized for its inhabitants the happiness, peace, and plenty of Paraguay. The Anglo-Saxon and the thirst for gold ushered in, alas ! on these poor creatures—made in the divine image, and called equally with ourselves to an eternal share in the love of the Sacred Heart—not a miserable existence, but absolute destruction. The love of Mammon has been the murderer of the native owners of the

soil. The iron heart and the iron arm of the Anglo-Saxon invaders have cleared all before them. In 1862, Mr. Hittel, who is not a Catholic, and whom we hold to be an impartial witness, made a study of the subject, and he thus speaks of the destruction of the Indian population of California :—

The Indians are a miserable race, destined to speedy destruction. Fifteen years ago, they numbered 50,000 or more : now there may be 7,000 of them. They were driven from their hunting grounds and fishing grounds by the whites, and they stole cattle for food (rather than starve) ; and to punish and prevent their stealing, the whites made war on them and slew them. Such has been the origin of most of the Indian wars, which have raged in various parts of the State almost continuously during the last twelve years. Scarcely a month has elapsed since 1849, without some hostile encounters between the red men and the whites in some parts of the State. At the present time, the American residents of Humboldt country are at war with the Indians there. The poor Indian, a fool, and armed only with the bow and arrow, is no match for the rich American, armed with rifle and revolver, and mounted on a horse, which saves him from fatigue, takes him swiftly to the best points of attack, and carries him still more swiftly from the danger. For every white man that has been killed, fifty Indians have fallen. In 1848, nearly every little valley had its tribe, and there were dozens of tribes in the Sacramento basin, but now most of these tribes have been entirely destroyed.\*

We have been ourselves assured by eye-witnesses that such incidents as the following have frequently happened in the gold diggings. A man would be quietly cleaning his gun or rifle on a Sunday morning, when he would espy an Indian in the distance, and, without the least hesitation, would fire at him as a mark. The Indians were fair game, just as bear or elk were, and men would shoot them by way of pastime, not caring whether the mark was a "buck" or a "squaw," as they call them—that is, a man or a woman. Murder became thus a relaxation. And we must add, that not only American citizens, but also men who pride themselves on the greater civilization and virtue of their country, nearer home, thus imbrued their hands with reprobate levity in the blood of their fellow creatures.† Men have been heard seriously to argue that the Indians and Chinese have no immortal souls, and that

---

\* Resources of California, p. 288.

† When Governor Willar authorized W. T. Jarboe to organize a company to make war on the Indians—says the *San Francisco Overland and Ocean Mail*—in seventy days they had fifteen battles with the Indians ; killed more than 400 of them ; took 600 of them prisoners, and had only three of their own number wounded and one killed. Under the licence of the law ; under the cover of night ; in the security of your arms ; in the safety of your ambush ; you have murdered in cold blood more than 400 sleeping, unarmed, unoffending Indians—men, women, and children. Mothers and infants shared the common fate. Little children in baskets, and even babes, had their heads smashed to pieces or cut open.—Marshall, vol. ii. p. 259.

we have no duty to them as to fellow-men. "What! help to civilize them! What! they have souls! They have no business with civilization, and have no souls." And another person argued, as he thought, in a way which showed a more pious and spiritual nature, and was more commendable. He said he did not wish to promote civilization and Christianity among the Indians; they did not take to it, and always remained the devil's vineyard. "Let us serve the cause of the Lord by destroying this vineyard; I am always ready to assist in the destruction of those red devils." We had frequently read of the cowardly and disgusting practice of killing off the Indians by spreading disease among them; but it was the lot of a recent traveller well known to us to meet with a person who admitted himself to be an adept in this hideous art. He was a tall, thin man, with high cheek-bones, and lank, dark hair, and a short beard. He was a hard drinker, and seasoned all his language with blasphemy. He had sought his fortune in many places, and seemed always on the move. He knew something of everybody. The conversation turned upon the Indian population. "Oh," said he, "I have trapped considerable of that vermin," and he went on to describe the various effectual means of destruction, and was very proud of "pox bait," which he had always found to answer admirably. It is used in this way: take a bundle of clothes which have been used by a small-pox patient, and lay them in the track of an Indian tribe; they pick up the clothes, and don them with great demonstrations of joy; but, in a short time, the infection takes effect, and the whole tribe will be decimated or perhaps destroyed by the disease. This fiend boasted that he had perpetrated similar deeds on more than one occasion, and said it was the best way in which the white settlers could clear any section of the country they might require to squat in. There was another man who was a notorious villain, and was, at the time we refer to, flying from justice. He admitted that he had shot six white men in early days in California. "And how many Indians?" "Oh," said he, "of red men, can't possibly say; never reckoned them in; remember learnt shooting upon them; was bred and reared in Texas; and used to go out on horseback with my gun most days to get a little Indian shooting." Upon being reproached for such horrible atrocities, he replied, almost with a smile, "Suppose I was rather a bad boy in those days; have put away those deeds now; will do 'em no more; poor mother was always fretting for me; was rather a bad boy, and no two ways about that." We should be very sorry to imply that these horrible deeds are perpetrated only

by inhabitants of the United States. On the contrary, it is certain that men, who from circumstances lapse into a state of semi-savage life, without public opinion to check them, living in the wilderness and the bush, and without religion, naturally become so enslaved to their passions, that at last they commit the foulest abominations and the most horrible murders, as though they were mere pastimes. We have read abundant examples of this in India and other British colonies; and we should blush for a comparison between early British rule in India and the acts of the Washington Legislature with respect to the North American Indians. The American Government passed many wise and humane laws in favour of the Indian. It was not her fault that pioneers, squatters, buccaneers, and outlaws, at a distance, laughed at her laws, and set them at defiance.

The other contrast is quickly drawn. It shall be the contrast of names. We do not wish to found any strong argument upon it. Names are not actions, and yet to call a man hard names is the next thing to giving him hard blows; and we know that, "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Let the two lists go down in parallel columns, and illustrate the old times and the new.

Spanish baptisms of localities  
or settlements,

San Francisco.  
Sacramento.  
La Purisima Concepcion.  
Trinidad.  
Jesus Maria.  
Santa Cruz.  
Nuestra Señora di Solidad.  
Los Angeles, Reina de.  
San Jose.  
San Pedro.  
San Miguel.  
San Rafael.  
Santa Clara.  
Santa Barbara.  
San Luis Obispo.  
San Paolo.  
Buena Vista.  
Mariposa.  
San Fernando.  
Alcatraz.  
Contra Costa.  
San Mateo.  
Plumas.

Yankee baptisms of localities  
or settlements,

Jackass Gulch.  
Jim Crow Cañon.  
Loafer Hill.  
Whisky Diggings.  
Slap Jack Bar.  
Yankee Doodle.  
Skunk Gulch.  
Chicken Thief Flat.  
Ground Hog's Glory.  
Hell's Delight.  
Devil's Wood.  
Sweet Revenge.  
Shirt-tail Cañon.  
Rough and Ready.  
Rag Town.  
Git up and Git.  
Bob Ridley Flat.  
Humpback Slide.  
Swell-head Diggings.  
Bloody Run.  
Murderers' Bar.  
Rat-trap Slide.  
Hang Town.

We may now dismiss these contrasts, which we have only insisted on in order to bring into greater relief the spirit of God and the spirit of Mammon. The Spaniard went with the tenderest devotedness to serve and save the Indian, recognizing him from the first as a brother. The Yankee came, straining every nerve and energy in the pursuit of wealth; the Indian was in his way; he recognized no spiritual ties of brotherhood; his soul presented to him no divine image deserving of his love and service;—rather it was said, let him be trodden into the mire, or perish from the face of the land. The former cast over their humble settlements, on the coast and inland, the sacred association of the names of mysteries and holy saints, so that men for all generations might be reminded that they are of the race of the people of God; whereas the latter have named many of the places where they have dug for gold with the names of their hideous crimes, and with terms compared to which the nomenclature of savage and uncivilized tribes is Christian and refined.

This sketch of the principal features of the two occupations of California, as they have borne upon the native population, may be sufficient for our present purpose. We shall presently dwell upon the better qualities in the American character—the natural foundations upon which religion has to be built. Our object is not to write a political or commercial essay; all we attempt is to note the action of the Church at the present day upon the heterogeneous elements which compose the population of California, and to record as briefly as may be the several influences observable as making up that action.

It has long been a favourite theme with the anti-Catholic philosophers of the day to descant upon the feebleness of the Catholic Church. They judge her as a purely human institution, good in her day; but her day is gone. She was a good nurse, who held the leading-strings which mankind needed in early childhood. But we have grown to the ripeness of perfection; and the good nurse has grown old and past work: she may be allowed therefore to potter about the world, as an old servant round her master's hall and grounds, till she dies and is buried away. We may render some little service if we point to one more instance of her present vigour and vitality in our own day;—if we can show that she is stamping her impress upon the lettered horde that has overrun the western shore, as she did formerly upon the unlettered hordes that possessed themselves of the plains of Italy, or of the wolds of England. We believe that she is by degrees assimilating into herself the strange mass of the Californian popu-



lation; she is standing out in the midst of them as the only representative of religious unity, order, and revelation. She is executing her commission in California to-day as faithfully as she did when Peter entered Rome, or Augustine Kent, or Xavier Asia, or Solano the wilds of South America.

The work of grace, through the Church of Christ, is gaining sensibly and irresistibly upon the population of California. We are far from foreseeing a day when all its inhabitants will be of one faith and one mind, or from saying that the number of conversions to the faith is prodigious and unheard-of. But we affirm that the Catholic Church, with a far greater rapidity than in England, is daily attaining a higher place in the estimation of the people, is becoming more and more the acknowledged representative of Christianity, and is actually gaining in numbers, piety, and authority. The sects there, as elsewhere in America, are ceasing by degrees to exercise any religious or spiritual influence upon the people; they act as political and social agents, and hold together as organizations by the force of local circumstances, which are wholly independent of religion. As forms of religion, the people see through them, and have no confidence in them; the consequence is, that an immense proportion are without any religion at all, and many join the Catholic Church. It was the policy of Imperial Rome to open her gates to every form of heathenism: every god was tolerated, every god was accepted, no matter how incongruous or contradictory its presence by the side of others. The empire was intent upon one thing, self-aggrandisement; and for religion it did not care. Thoughtful men smiled or sneered at those mythologies and divinities, and their forms of worship; and the people became cold and indifferent to them. They were dying of this contempt, when behold the newly-imported presence of the Fisherman into their midst, with his Catechism of Christian Doctrine, inspired one and all with a new life and energy; the gods began to speak, and the people began to hear them. It was not that a new faith had been awakened in their old idolatry; but a new hostility and hatred had been aroused against the majesty of consistent truth, which stood before them humble, yet confounding them. They began to believe themselves to be devout pagans, and to prove the sincerity of their convictions by endeavouring to smite down the divine figure of the Catholic Church, which claimed a universal homage and a universal power. Events strangely repeat themselves in the world. That which occurred among the sects of ancient Rome

is now taking place among the sects of America.\* Men smile at their pretensions; their convictions are not moulded by them, and they will not submit to their discipline, or bow to their authority. But the sects object to death, and they think to prolong the term of their existence, not by a life of faith, but by a life of sustained enmity against the religion which is slowly gaining upon them, and supplanting them in the mind and affection of the people.

There are many who believe that the day is not far distant when the Catholics of America will have to brace themselves up to go through the fire, for American religious persecution would be like an American civil war, determined and terrible. It would carry us beyond the limits of our scope to attempt to trace the steps by which persecution is approaching. This spirit has ever existed in the New England States. *Know-nothingism* was a political and social form of it which failed for a time; but we believe that since the war has closed an anti-Catholic league has been formed, and the knowledge of the immense progress made by the Church amidst the din of war, in the camp and in the hospital, in North and South, among officers and men, has quickened this movement. The Government is not to blame for this. We believe the American Government, in point of religion, to be perfectly colourless. It is noteworthy that nowhere in the world has religion made more rapid progress in this century than in the United States. During fifty years of this century, the increase stands noted in the "Catholic Metropolitan Almanac," in the following figures:—

	Dioceses.	Bishops.	Churches.	Priests.	Colleges, Schools, &c.
1808	1	2	80	68	5
1857	41	41	2882	1872	200

This is a much larger increase than we have witnessed in England; and we cannot doubt that the Church is repairing in America the losses she has suffered in Europe through the pride, abuse of grace, and apostasy of many of her children.

*In California the Church has no easy task before her.* It is no longer the simple and rude Vandal, Dane, or Lombard, she has to lead into her fold, but a population composed of men of keen wits, of the most varied, world-wide expe-

---

\* Every form of worship is permitted in America—African fetishism, the sensuality of Mormon, the idolatry of Bhudda and Brahma. Chinese josses are publicly adored in California, and the Mormon concubinage has been honoured by political privileges and the rights of a territory.



riences, and drawn from countries in which they have been more or less within the reach of Catholic teaching. These are the men whom she has now to reduce into the obedience of faith.

We are not of those who imagine that Almighty God has lavished all the treasures of natural virtues upon one nation, and has withheld them proportionately from others. In intellectual gifts men differ much less one from another than is often supposed, as with their physical strength and stature the difference, on the whole, is not very large. And so their moral natural gifts, if considered in their full circle, will be found before the tribunal of an impartial judge to be on the whole pretty evenly distributed among the nations. One nation has faith and trust, another understanding and subtlety, another mercy and compassion, another truthfulness and fidelity, another tenderness and love, another humility and docility, another courage and energy, another determination and patience, another purity, another reverence. These natural virtues may be elevated into supernatural, and then that nation is *really* the *greatest* which has made best use of the grace of God. The bounteous hand of God has enriched every part of the canopy of heaven with stars and planets, differing infinitely in light, colour, distance, size, and combination, and He leaves no portion in absolute poverty or darkness; and the "distilling lips" and "shining countenance" have scattered in every direction over His immortal creation precious gifts of natural virtues, set like gems in the souls of men the moment His fingers first fashioned them. It will, no doubt, often require the study and patient love of an apostle's heart to discover them, so defiled and obscured have they become; but they are ever there, though dormant, and when once they become subject to the touch of divine grace, it is surprising what inclination and facility towards their Eternal Father break forth and become apparent.

Now, in speaking of the sufferings of the Church in California, we have been marking some of the worst features of the Anglo-Saxon invasion. But in viewing, as we are about to do, the future prospects of the Church, we must, at the outset, point towards some of those better qualities and characteristics, upon which, under God, the Church has to build her hopes.

If once turned to God from materialism and mammon-worship, we are persuaded that the American would rank among the foremost Catholics of the world, not shining, perhaps, in the extraordinary gifts of faith, and in the offices of the contemplative life, like the children of Italy and Spain, but fruitful and

overflowing in good works and in pushing forward every active operation of charity.

Of the Californians it may be said, that they are bold and independent adventurers, and that they admire these qualities in others. They are quick and devoted in their own business, and appreciate devotedness in the business (the Chinese call it "sky-business") of priests and nuns. They are practical and determined, and failure after failure does not discourage them. Health and life have no value, when any temporal end is to be gained. And, therefore, they are struck by the Catholic Church, her bishops and missionaries, steadily pursuing her supernatural end, in spite of the allurements, distractions, and threats of the world; preaching always and at all times the same doctrines of faith and charity; ready day and night to obey the call of her poorest member, in the camp and the battlefield, in the penury and hardship of emigration, in pestilence and fever wards, in no matter what clime or among what people; always alike joyful to save the soul of the negro, the red man or the white man; esteeming suffering, illness, contempt, poverty, and persecution, when endured for God or for His souls, as so many jewels in her crown, and holding life itself cheap and contemptible in comparison with the one end she has in view.

The Californians are a singularly inquisitive and intelligent race. Everybody is able to read and write; and even the common labourer has his morning newspaper brought every day of his life to his cottage door. The state prison of San Quintin shows some curious statistics of the proportion of native Americans and foreigners, who are able to read and write. The comparison, as will be seen, is in favour of the United States:—January 1, 1862, there were 257 prisoners, natives of the United States; of these only 29 were unable to read or write. And there were 333 of foreign birth; of these 141 were unable to read or write. The spirit of free inquiry and private judgment, which brought about the apostasy of the sixteenth century, is carried by Californians to its legitimate conclusions. They are not stopped halfway as Anglicans are by love or reverence for what may appear to be a venerable, time-honoured establishment, full of nationality and wealth, and hoary with respectability. They wish to learn the reason *why* of everything, and they are little inclined to take anything upon a mere *ipse dixit*. They love knowledge, and desire to obtain it easily, so they are great frequenters of lectures and sermons; and will go anywhere to hear them when they believe them to be good. This gives the Catholic priest a strong and solid advantage over every other minister. He is able to give an

account of his faith, to show the reasonableness of submission, to prove that faith rests upon an infallible basis, that religion is not a caprice of reason, not a mere expedient, not a police, which was useful in ignorant days, and may be still useful for superstitious minds and a leading-string for children and the weak. Show the American that the submission of his intellect to the divine intellect of the Church of God is not its destruction, but its perfection and elevation, and his intellectual pride will yield as quickly as any man's. Explain to them the doctrine of the Holy Ghost and his indwelling life in the Church and in the individual, and they will be ready to call out, "Give us also the Holy Ghost." There are some natures so confiding and so simple that it is enough to address them as the centurion did his soldiers, or to tell them what to believe, and they believe at once. It is a blessed thing to have the grace of little children to believe from the first; but there are some who have placed themselves out of the pale of this great grace, or have been born outside it, on account of the sins of their parents, and the mould they have been formed in. This is the case with the Anglo-Saxon race, and pre-eminently so with the American. And the Church accommodates herself to the peculiarities of the human mind, with infinite charity and condescension, seeking the surest avenue to the conversion of the soul to God, in faith, hope, and charity. She is ready to meet the American on his own ground, and to give the clearest and most convincing of explanations. Again, the Americans are what has been called "viewy," and with all their practical power and love for the positive, they prefer to have the truth presented to them as in a landscape, in which the imagination is able to throw the reason into relief on the foreground. Compare the instructions and sermons of Peach, Gother, Fletcher, and Challoner, excellent and solid though they be, where the imagination has no play, with those of Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop Manning, Dr. Newman, and our meaning is at once illustrated.

A priest who should draw his sermons out of Suarez or Petavius, rather than from Perrone or Bouvier, or some handbook of controversy,—his homilies on the gospel, from, *e. g.*, Dionysius the Carthusian, illustrating them from such works as "Burder's Oriental Customs," "Harmer's Observations, &c.," rather than heap up platitudes and common generalities, or should even take our common little Catechism and develop its doctrine and popularize it by abundant illustrations from Scripture, history, from the arts, science, commerce, government—familiar themes to the American mind,—would be certain to attract around his pulpit large audiences of anxious souls,

and, by God's blessing, to win them to Catholic truth with astonishing facility.

The Americans are keenly alive to coarse or rough manners in a priest. They will not suffer masterful or domineering language from him in the pulpit or in private. Above all they consider the "brogue" to be a capital sin—*talem devita*. This is a little inconsistent, perhaps, in men who are not themselves remarkable either for the *suaviter in modo* or for a reticence of provincialisms and cant words and phrases. But still we consider, unhesitatingly, that the brogue is more prejudicial to a clergyman's influence upon Americans than upon Englishmen; and also, that a priest, through refinement of mind and manners, can effect more in America than in England. Whether the reason for this fact is that the latter qualities are rarer in the States than here, or that, having no hereditary titles, Americans attach greater value to adornments of mind and manners, we may not pause to consider.

Again: they have been for the greater part cut off from the traditions of home and family. The parish clergyman or district minister under whom they once sat, the bitter zeal of old ladies who consider Catholicity to be a species of sorcery, priests to be all Jesuits, Jesuits to be one with the devil in cunning and malice, and who know how to insert a sting into the life of the friend who withdraws from their opinions; the quiet humdrum of life in the States or in Europe, so favourable to the *status in quo*—all these anti-Catholic influences are far away, and there is little substitute for them in California, where there is a singular absence of public opinion and of social despotism.

On the other hand, it may be said that they have come into the presence of the life of Catholicity in ways which impress them by the novelty of their situation. In the first place, their belief in the possibility of living for an invisible and supernatural end, is quickened by their experience of the country they have come to. They came to seek for fortune, and they thought they were the first, but they found that the Catholic Church had been there long before them, perfectly satisfied without the gold and silver which has drawn *them*, in the accomplishment of her mission of peace and salvation. For long years Catholic missionaries had abandoned home and civilization in order to reside on the rolling plains, or valleys, or sea-coast, with the untutored and debased Indian, with no other recompense than one they looked for hereafter. They had not become savages and wild men, as men often do, conforming to the Indian, who lived upon grasshoppers, and worms, and insects, or roots and grasses or fruits, or at best

on the produce of the chase. But by the constraining power of love, and with a divine message they had drawn the wild Indian around them, taught them various arts and trades, the growth of the olive, of the vine, and of corn, how to spin and weave, the first elements of peace and commerce. They had instructed them in the Christian faith and helped them on the way to heaven. The old remains of their work are scattered over the country in some five-and-twenty principal mission establishments. The great "adobe" walls of their churches, varying from four to eight feet thick, the rude sculpture, the gaudy frescoes, the paintings and carvings brought all the way from Spain and Mexico, the little square belfry standing alone, the cemetery, and the avenue of trees planted by the friars along the roads which lead up to the mission; the orchards still fruitful, where the swine besport themselves and the coney burrows, as at Santa Clara; the mournful olive-trees of the mission, which, in spite of age, yield the best oil in the country; the crosses, memorials of piety and faith, set up here and there, and the Christian traditions still left among a few survivors of the old inhabitants, often speak solemnly and instructively to the heart of the pioneer who has come in hot haste to seek a fortune. How can he help at times being touched, when he is with his own thoughts in solitude, perhaps in sadness and disappointment, in the presence of these old remnants which tell of pioneers who came with another and holier end in view than that in which he sees himself foiled and mistaken! We will venture to say that these ancient memorials of the faith and devotedness of the Catholic missionaries are as sweet, and as dear, and as impressive to many a Californian, as the gorgeous old piles of Catholic piety in England are to the dense and civilized Protestant population which lives around them and profits by their revenues.

Among the first pioneers of California, before the discovery of gold, in search of an agricultural district and of a genial climate, came a hardy band of earnest Irishmen. They were in a high sense pioneers, for they were the first caravan that found a way across the plains and Rocky Mountains from the Eastern States. They passed many long months on the road, and were exposed to every imaginable hardship and difficulty. They had to clear the forest as they went, to make a passage for their waggons. Sometimes they would spend a week breaking a road through great rocks and enormous boulders, which obstructed a river-bed or a mountain-pass; their waggons often came to pieces through hardship and exposure; they cut down trees to mend them, and had to extemporize

wheels and harness as they journeyed slowly on. They had placed all their trust and confidence in God—in the rain and wind, in the thick forest, and on the snowy mountain, they always turned to Him—they served and worshipped Him as well as the circumstances would allow, and He led them at last into the Land of Promise which they looked to.

After them came another caravan from the States, but formed of men of a very different stamp. Licence, crime, and disorder of the most appalling character marked their steps. We will enter into no details. They suffered innumerable hardships, they fell so short of provisions, and were reduced to such straits, that finally, in despair of ever reaching the rich plains of California, they killed one of their party, and made their evening meal upon human flesh. The next morning one mile off they descried the land they longed for, and immense herds of elk feeding on the plains. They felt that the hand of God had struck them. The Irish Catholics soon rallied round the few pastors who remained in the country; they established themselves near the missions. Soon they lifted up their voice calling for more spiritual assistance. The riches of earth were of little value to them without the blessings of Heaven. The zeal of the Holy See anticipated their own. Missionaries were on the way to the scene of labour, and a devoted Bishop was soon appointed to rule over them.

When, after 1849, the rush to the diggings took place, and all men were suffering from "the gold fever" and "silver on the brain," spending their money in wholesale gambling, making fortunes one week and losing them the next, and every man's head seemed to be turned by the helter-skelter excitement, the Catholic Church, in her calm majesty, was growing up in the midst of the turmoil, and occupying her position as the city on the mountain, and the light shining before men. The zeal of the Archbishop and clergy, and faithful Irish, knew no limits. Churches sprang up on the conspicuous eminences of the city of San Francisco, and in the principal thoroughfares. And that vast assemblage of men, who had come together from all parts, without religion or God in their hearts, began to see that they were in the presence of the Catholic Church, and that the shadow of the Catholic towers and crosses had fallen upon them. As soon as the Holy See gave to San Francisco an Archbishop, the zealous sons of St. Patrick determined to build him a cathedral. The wages of a common hodman were £2. 10s. a day; nevertheless, while the Catholic with one hand worked or scrambled for wealth, with the other he freely gave to that



which is always dearest to his heart. The deep foundations of the cathedral were sunk, the walls arose, its massive time-keeping tower crowned the city, its solemn services were inaugurated. It was the result of fabulous sums of money, and of heroic devotedness on the part of pastors and people. Nor was this all. Large and handsome churches have sprung up in various parts of the city, like S. Ignatius's and S. Francis's, and others, such as the French church, S. Patrick's, S. Joseph's, the German church, and a number of smaller chapels. The unbelieving speculator, the "smart" trader, the landowner, and the miner, on his visit to the city, were all struck with these visible tokens of sincerity and zeal, without stint of generous alms, put forth by the Catholic Church from the very outset. Later, and stimulated by Catholic example, the various sects of Protestantism, Jews, Infidels, and Pagans, erected in several places their churches, temples, chapels, lecture-halls, and joss-houses. In point of churches, in numbers and construction, the Catholic communion in San Francisco stands far ahead of all others. But it is not in the erection of churches alone that Catholicity has, with the vigour of her perpetual youth, outstripped the sects, all of which, before they attain to half a century, become old and decrepit; for no sooner did the population roll in from the ocean and across the plains, than new wants at once arose—hospitals for the sick from the city, the country, and the mines; homes for the orphans, who were left alone in a far-off country, where men die in thousands from accident and violence, as well as from disease and natural causes; and schools for children, who are born more numerous, it is said, in California than in any other country. Here again the Catholic Church was first in devoted charity and anxious zeal for souls.

As to popular schools, before the Atlantic and Pacific oceans were bridged together by the iron rails of Panama, the gentle and devoted Sisters of the Presentation from Ireland, ladies by birth, tradition, and refinement, left their tranquil convents for the storm and troubles of life into the midst of which they were to be thrown in San Francisco. They, in their strict and peaceful inclosure, were to be calm, like the point which even in the whirlwind is always to be still and at rest. There, day by day, they teach one thousand children from infancy up to womanhood, the poor according to their wants, and the rich according to their requirements, and all this entirely *gratis*, looking to God alone to be their "reward exceeding great." Moreover, the only school in the State of California for Indians and negroes is established

and taught by them. In the State schools no coloured child would be allowed to set his foot. Thousands of children of Catholic, of Protestant, and Infidel parents have passed out into the world from under their considerate and enlightened care, and they bless them everywhere evermore. Such disinterested charities, such daily self-denial, such gentle and kindly sympathy, are not lost upon the wayward, go-ahead, and hardened Yankee. These are the lives which touch and melt and win him. This, he says, is practical religion. Next, in a state like California, orphanages became an early and a primary want. The Sisters of Charity first supplied them. Then hospitals were needed; and the Sisters of Mercy from Ireland said, "Here are hospitals." They possess the best hospital in the State. They watch the sick with a mother's care; and many a man learns on his bed of pain from their lips lessons which he has never heard in childhood, or has forgotten in manhood. In all these departments of popular instruction, orphanages, and hospitals, the Catholic Church in California leads the way, extending aid and care to all, without distinction of creed or nation. The Catholic convents and establishments stand out conspicuously to all the world on the heights and in the principal thoroughfares of San Francisco. These are all works which we attribute to the zeal of the Irish, and which prove to Americans, and they admit the proof, the faith and charity of the Catholic Church. They are an appeal to their heart and to their reason. And now for the appeal to their sense of honesty and justice. Take the Catholics of California as a body, and they stand before any other body for honesty in business. They nearly all came to the State poor men; some had to borrow money for their journey; but they have worked their way up; and now, though the Jews are the largest capitalists, and the Yankees, from being more numerous, hold absolutely a greater amount of wealth, the Irish and Catholics, as a class, are more uniformly well off. The mean of comfort and sufficiency is probably higher among them than among others. And they have obtained for themselves a high reputation for honesty and honourable conduct in business. It is impossible for a person without experience to form an idea of the amount of cheating and rascality which is often practised in trade and commerce. Robbery and lying, upon however large or mean a scale, when successful, will be called by a great number only "smart conduct." A man is not tabooed and banished the Exchange and the market for cheating his creditors, and defrauding the public, as he would be in London or Liverpool. He can live down such public opinion



as there is, and many of his friends extend a misplaced pity to him, or think none the worse of him for his behaviour. A man may become bankrupt three or four times, and become richer each time; this is not uncommon, and there are certain persons with whom it is taken for granted that they are thus "making their pile." "So and so has just caved in," said a merchant; "and he had \$20,000 worth of goods from me last week, and all that's 'run into the ground,' and no two ways about that. He'll be through the courts whitewashed in a few weeks." "Well," said the interlocutor, "you won't let him have more goods without ready money?" "Yes, I shall. He'll just come to me for goods to set up again; and he knows I'll let him have them, for he's a 'smart' fellow, he will be better able to pay me then than he ever has been before." In confirmation of our general statement, we may quote the words of Mr. Hittel:—

Insolvencies legally declared and cancelled by the courts are more frequent in San Francisco, in proportion to its population, than in any other part of the world. Our laws provide that any man who declares himself unable to pay his debts, and petitions to be released from them, may obtain a judicial discharge, unless he has been guilty of fraud; and as the fraud must be distinctly proved upon him before the discharge will be denied, the release is almost invariably obtained.

Again:—

There is no imprisonment for debt except in cases of fraud, and that the laws are so drawn, that it is almost impossible to prove . . . . Testimony admissible to prove a man a thief or a murderer, is not admissible if he be accused of fraud in contracting a debt. . . . In many ways the debtor is fenced about, so that the law seems to have been devised by men who had experience in swindling creditors, and wished to secure themselves against trouble in future. Every precaution is taken against the creditor, as though he were a public enemy; while the men who do not pay their debts are treated as though they were the soul of the state, and as though their mode of doing business should be encouraged at all costs. When a man gets in debt he can get out again without difficulty. . . . On every side can be seen men who have swindled creditors out of large amounts of money, and are themselves now living in extravagant or at least luxurious style. Such laws encourage habits of rash speculation, with the expectation that riches will come with success, and no discredit or loss to any save creditors with failure.

From this testimony of a long resident and man of business in California it will be readily understood how closely men's personal character for honesty will be scrutinized by persons who are not anxious to suffer in dealing with them. Now, inquiries have been made in various parts of the country, and it has been ascertained beyond a doubt that the Irish, or

American Irish Catholics, are considered the safest class of men to do business with. Whether it be early training, religion, the confessional, or the influence of the priests, so it is; they are trusted by a Yankee more readily than others are. Far be it from us to impeach the honesty, and sense of honour, of all save the Irish and Catholics. These natural virtues shine with the greatest brilliancy in many an unbelieving man of business. We but record a fact which is highly creditable to the Irish, and spreads the good odour of the religion they profess.

We have now to notice the direct action of the Archbishop and of the clergy upon the population. The bishop is the "*forma gregis facta ex animo*," "the city on the hill," "the candle placed high upon the candlestick," giving its light around; and on each prelate bestows what gifts He pleases. With these He illumines the world in the person of His minister.

Go, then, up California Street, turn round the cathedral of S. Mary's, and you will enter a miserable, dingy little house. This is the residence of the Archbishop of San Francisco and his clergy, who live with him in community. To the left are a number of little yards, and the back windows of the houses in which the Chinamen are swarming. Broken pots and pans, old doors, and a yellow compost, window-frames, faggots, remnants of used fireworks, sides of pig glazed and varnished, long strings of meat—God only knows *what* meat—hanging to dry, dog-kennels, dead cats, dirty linen in heaps, and white linen and blue cottons drying on lines or lying on rubbish—such is the view to the left. The odours which exhale from it, who shall describe? A spark would probably set the whole of these premises in a conflagration; and one is tempted to think that even a fire would be a blessing. To the right, adjoining the cathedral, is the yard where the Catholic boys come out to play; and in this yard stands a little iron or zinc cottage, containing two rooms. This is where the Archbishop lives; one is his bedroom, the other his office, where his secretaries are at work all day. No man is more poorly lodged in the whole city; and no man preaches the spirit of Evangelical poverty, a detachment in the midst of this money-worshipping city, like this Dominican Spanish Archbishop of San Francisco. From ten to one every morning, and for two or three hours every evening, his Grace, arrayed in his common white habit, and with his green cord and pectoral cross, receives all who come to consult him, to beg of him, to converse with him, be they who they may—emigrants, servants, merchants, the afflicted, the ruined, the

unfortunate. The example of such a life of disinterested zeal, holy simplicity and poverty, has told upon the inhabitants of San Francisco with an irresistible power. It has been one of the Catholic influences exercised by the Church on the population.

On taking possession of his See, when San Francisco was yet forming and building itself up, the first thing Dr. Alemany looked around for, was an edifying and zealous body of clergy. There were, indeed, already before him some few who are labouring in the vineyard to this day, but there was also there the refuse of Europe, men of scandalous life, and men affecting to be priests who were impostors. Whereupon he went over to Ireland, and entering into relations with the College of All Hallows, which had supplied so many devoted priests to other parts, he began to draw from that splendid seminary apostles for California: of whom, we believe, the first was the present Bishop at Marysville, Dr. O'Connell, so distinguished for his gentleness, learning, piety, and zeal for the salvation of the Indian as well as of the white man. May that College long continue to send forth its heroic bands of labourers who may be recognized everywhere as they are in California, as a virtuous and exemplary clergy! But the Archbishop, with the eye of a General, perceived that in order to make a deep impression upon the masses which were forming themselves with incredible activity in San Francisco and the country, it was necessary, in addition to the secular clergy, which were stationed in pickets through the city and country, to form a strong body of indefatigable men, who should act upon the population with all the accumulated power of a compact square. He therefore called into the field the Jesuit fathers. They came down in little numbers from Oregon and the Rocky Mountains, from the Eastern States, and from Piedmont. He assigned to them the old mission of Santa Clara, about forty miles from San Francisco, in order that they should at once open a college for the better classes; and also a site in San Francisco, among the sand-hills, in order to form a day college for the inhabitants of the city; and a church in which they should bring into play all those industries of devotion, retreats, sermons, lectures, novenas, and sodalities, which constitute so considerable an element of their influence in Rome, and upon the various population in the midst of which they establish themselves.

We have already shown that the Church was foremost in the formation of hospitals, orphanages and schools for the poor. She is also first in reputation for the excellence and solidity of her higher education. The College of Santa Clara has a public

name all down the Western coast, in Mexico and Peru, as being the most efficient house of education on the Pacific. But in order to appreciate the value of this work, it is necessary to understand something of the infidelity, immorality, and vice, against which it acts as a barrier. Precocity in vice in California exceeds anything we know in England; and the domestic inner life of the family, except among the Irish, who still maintain its sanctity in a wonderful degree, and a certain small minority of others, has probably less existence than in the Eastern States. In the State system, boys and girls attend the same schools up to seventeen and eighteen. We have heard of a college in which boys and girls were educated together and lived under the same roof; and we have been told of even girls' boarding-schools having been broken up on account of vice and disease. But rather than speak ourselves, we prefer to quote the published evidence of a Californian, as to the moral state of society.

In no part of the world is the individual more free from restraint. Men, and women, and children, are permitted to do nearly as they please. High wages, migratory habits, and bachelor life are not favourable to the maintenance of stiff social rules among men, and the tone of society among women must partake to a considerable extent of that among men, especially in a country where women are in a small minority, and are therefore much courted. Public opinion, which as a guardian of public morals is more powerful than the forms of law, loses much of its power in a community where the inhabitants are not permanent residents. A large portion of the men in California live either in cabins or in hotels, remote from women relatives, and therefore uninfluenced by the powers of a home. It is not uncommon for married women to go to parties and balls in company with young bachelor friends. The girls commence going into "society" about fifteen, and then receive company alone, and go out alone with young men to dances and other places of amusement. In this there is a great error: too much liberty is allowed to girls in the States on the Atlantic slope, and still greater liberty is given here, where, as they ripen earlier, they should be more guarded. \*

Again:

The relation between the sexes is unsound. Unfortunate women are numerous, and separations and divorces between married couples frequent. No civilized country can equal us in the proportionate number of divorces. Our laws are not so lax as those of several States east of the Mississippi; but the circumstances of life are more favourable to separation. The small proportion of women makes a demand for the sex, and so when a woman is oppressed by her husband she can generally find somebody else who will not oppress her, and *she* will apply for a divorce. The abundance of money is here felt also. To prosecute a divorce costs money, and many

---

\* "Resources of California," p. 364.

cannot pay in poorer countries. During 1860, eighty-five divorce suits were commenced in San Francisco, and in sixty-one of these, or three-fourths of the cases, the wives were the plaintiffs. \*

We need add no comment. Such being the tone and condition of society, of what inestimable value must not good Catholic colleges be to the whole country! They are highly appreciated by many who are not Catholics: for they send their children to Santa Clara, and to the convents of Notre Dame, being fully persuaded that they will not only be educated in the soundest principles of morality, and be fenced in from evil, but will receive a higher intellectual training than they could elsewhere. Society, indeed, must modify any particular system of education; and the Jesuits have had to depart from their traditional practice of a thorough classical training, in favour of positive sciences, especially chemistry and mineralogy, and to adopt the utilitarian line of instruction, rather than that which is the habit in Europe. Their colleges in Santa Clara and in San Francisco, and the schools of Notre Dame, must be marked as the principal educational establishments in California; and they are telling steadily upon the people.

The Archbishop has also opened another college in behalf of the middle classes, which no doubt will bear its fruit. All are thus amply provided for; and no one points a finger of scorn towards the Catholic Church for ignorance and neglect of education; rather she is looked upon as pre-eminent in her training, and men external to her communion send their children to learn wisdom at her establishments.

The sand-hills in the midst of which the college and Church of S. Ignatius were placed, have long since been carried away by the vigorous application of steam power, and these religious buildings stand out prominent upon the widest street in California.

A brief allusion to the work carried on in this Church, and we come to a conclusion. We have already referred at some length to the sermon and lecture-going habit of the Americans, and to the conquests which the Catholic Church alone has the power to make among them, by addressing herself to their good qualities, and thus leading them to God by the cords of Adam. Long ago the Archbishop perceived this and acted promptly by planting in the capital, in addition to the busy, active secular clergy, this community of St. Ignatius, with its leisure, talent, and training, to meet

---

\* P. 368.

special requirements; and statistics would show with what success his Grace's plans have been crowned. But we must pass on, and confine our notice to a particular industry of the society, which at San Francisco has received a special blessing. Or rather it is not a specialty of the Society, but a common arm in the armoury of the Church; we refer to the system of sodalities and confraternities. The idea was first introduced by S. Francis and S. Dominic in their third orders, and was perfected and practically applied to various devout ends by S. Charles, S. Ignatius, and S. Philip, in the sixteenth century. S. Charles covered his diocese with Confraternities as with so many nets. S. Philip organized the Little Oratory, and the Jesuits wherever they establish themselves are careful to found the Sodality of the B. Virgin, and that of S. Joseph as the Patron of the *Bona Mors*, in their colleges or among the frequenters of their public churches. Nothing can exceed the importance of these sodalities and confraternities, and we dwell on the subject all the more willingly, because of our own need of their more perfect development and spread among ourselves. It strikes us that such associations are more than ever desirable in countries like England and America, where external dangers and seductions are so numerous and insidious, and ecclesiastical influence so limited.

In Catholic countries the population is studded with religious houses, convents, and communities, and the priesthood is numerous, visible to the eye of the public, clothed in its own dress, affecting all classes of society, and holding a political and national status of its own. Their influence, therefore, is strong and ever present. It is otherwise with the English clergy, who have not one of the advantages alluded to, but are absorbed in begging and building with one hand, while with the other they hastily baptize, absolve, and anoint the newborn, the viator, and the dying. Now well-organized sodalities of laymen supply the absence of those more powerful influences, of which we daily lament the loss. They are a security to each member against himself, and they quicken him with a new zeal and activity for his neighbour. In San Francisco there is a sodality for men, and one for women. They hold their respective meetings, sing the Office of the Blessed Virgin, receive instructions, and frequent the Sacraments on appointed days: they have also their library. The object is purely spiritual, and we believe there is no kind of obligatory subscription. Is a youth being led away, or in the midst of dangers, his friend induces him to join him in the sodality. It is a spiritual citadel into which all may enter, and find a new

armour and strength against self and the world. Those newly born to the faith are gradually and easily edified and perfected in their new religion, by contact with the more fervent members whom they find in the sodality. Such a system cannot be too widely spread. Why should not a sodality be established in every considerable parish? After a time, all would loudly proclaim that they had built up a tower of strength within the Church. But we may not dwell longer on these topics.

The great spiritual dangers in California are rank infidelity and unblushing naturalism: the one and only promise of religion, the one hope of salvation, is in the attitude and position of the Catholic Church. Mr. Hittel sums up the relative numbers thus: about fourteen per cent. of the male population frequent some place of worship; of the remaining eighty-six per cent., one-third occasionally go to church, according to the attraction there, and two-thirds never go near a church, and are not to be counted as Christians. He estimates the Protestants at 10,000, of whom the Episcopalians are numbered at only 600 communicants, with twenty churches and eighteen clergymen; the Jews at 2,000. The Catholic priests, he adds, claim 80,000 communicants in their Church, and they are more attentive to the forms of their faith than are the Protestants. In a word, Catholicity is in the ascendant, the sects are in the decline, and the battle is between paganism with a mythology of dollars, and the Church of God with her precepts of self-denial and her promises of eternal life.



## ART. II.—THE VICEROYS OF IRELAND.

*History of the Viceroys of Ireland ; with Notices of the Castle of Dublin and its chief Occupants in Former Times.* By J. T. GILBERT, Esq. Dublin : Duffy. 1865.

ONE of Strafford's correspondents, professing to describe the Irish "out of long experience," declared that he had "found them to be a nation as ready to take the bit in their teeth upon all advantages, although they pay for it, as any people living." The description, contemptuous as it is, is in one sense a summary of the history of Ireland for six centuries after the invasion. That history, if we except a very limited and variable district in which the forms of a settled conquest were commonly maintained, is but the record of a series of struggles in which force alternated with intrigue, and in which, while the conquered never laid aside the hope of recovering his independence, the conqueror too commonly felt that his conquest was but nominal.

According to the theory of the old historians, the history of a country was little more than the record of the fortunes of its rulers. Of a dependency this was especially true; and there are few dependencies regarding which it is so literally verified as regarding Ireland. The story of Ireland in its relations to England, is often a mere sequence of names, hardly wrought into a connected web of narrative; its occasional picturesqueness frittered away or lost in a maze of petty, even though striking, episodes; its interest unpointed by any of those more comprehensive lessons which give value to history; exhibiting no principle of government but force—no economic theory but the creation of revenue—no policy but subjugation, to be accomplished by any means and at any cost. Such a history as this can hardly be told, except in the lives of the successive rulers, by whose personal will, rather than by a fixed or settled rule of government, it was directed.

Mr. Gilbert, therefore, has done wisely for the practical interest of his book upon Ireland in throwing it into the form of a history of the Viceroys. It is a subject for which the studies arising out of his popular and interesting "History of Dublin" had prepared him; and the portion of his task comprised in the goodly volume now before us, although it



s the part in which he will have derived least assistance from his earlier inquiries, bears in every page the evidence of exact and laborious investigation of every source, whether printed or manuscript, of the general history of the country, as well as of the personal history of the individual governors. The volume now completed comprises certainly the more difficult, as well as the less interesting, portion of the series: but it exhibits so much learning; such a familiarity with the original records, as well as with the historians whether ancient or modern; such a power of constructing an attractive story out of a mass of obscure and apparently uninteresting facts and authorities;—that his book will go far to redeem even the earlier period of the post-invasion history of Ireland from its traditional character of dulness and monotony. And when we recall the liveliness and brilliancy of the sketches of Dublin life in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with which his “History of Dublin” abounds, we cannot help anticipating for the present work, when it shall have been completed by the addition of the Viceroyalties of the sixteenth and later centuries, a popularity and a success new indeed in the annals of the historical literature of Ireland.

The present volume (which, with its appendix of annotations, contains above six hundred octavo pages) brings the history only to the close of the reign of Henry VII., commencing with Hugh de Lacy,\* and ending with that famous Earl of Kildare, of whom, when his accusers told the king, Henry VII., that “all Ireland could not rule this earl,” the king replied, “Then in good faith this earl shall rule all Ireland.”

As to this early period, considerable obscurity exists, as well regarding the title, as the nature and extent of the authority, of the king’s representative in Ireland; and Mr. Gilbert has done well in selecting the name of Viceroy, which, while it may appear to have been official, yet may not only cover by its generality the various titles which were borne at different periods by the English governors, but may also be consistent with every form of commission and every degree of authority with which they were at any time invested. The earliest title which the English representative in Ireland bore appears to have been that of “Custos,”

---

\* Mr. Gilbert, writes Hugues de Lasci, following in this and in many other names, as De Curci, Fitz-Estevane, Mont-Marreis, Lorean O’Tuatheil (Lawrence O’Toole), &c., the old Norman or Celtic orthography. We shall retain, except in extracts, the popular modernized forms of the several names.

Warden, or Keeper; but this name was changed at intervals into Justiciary, Deputy, and Lieutenant, or Lord Deputy and Lord Lieutenant. Mr. Gilbert\* states that, from the close of the twelfth century, the chief governor of the Anglo-Norman colony in Ireland was usually styled the Chief Justiciary,—*Capitalis Justiciarius*; and he derives that title from the uses of the courts of Normandy and England. An instance, nevertheless, is mentioned by Carte† as late as the beginning of the fourteenth century, in which Edmund le Botiller is styled *Custos Hibernie*; and in another commission, seven years later, enrolled in the Exchequer of Ireland, the same Edmund is described as again *Custos Terræ Hiberniæ*. In both cases, too, we find a curious evidence that by this name was meant the office of the Viceroyalty strictly. Edmund le Botiller was succeeded in the Viceroyalty by John Wogan; and when this Wogan repassed into England, Edmund was again appointed to govern the kingdom in the absence of Wogan, but as *his* (Wogan's) Deputy or Lieutenant. This subordinate commission Botiller declined, on the ground, as it would seem, that it was unworthy of one who had been already Chief Governor; and accordingly, in a patent roll of 6 Edw. II., preserved in the Exchequer, which contains this commission to Botiller as Deputy of Wogan, there is a subsequent entry, "*Vacat, quia idem Edmundus illam commissionem noluit accipere*;" while immediately afterwards follows another commission, in which Edmund le Botiller is made *Custos Terræ Hiberniæ*.‡ The title Deputy was often used indifferently with that of Lieutenant, and both titles alike were bestowed directly by the Crown; but the Deputy was sometimes (as in the proposal made to Le Botiller) the Deputy, not of the King, but of an absent Lord-Lieutenant; and difficulties sometimes arose as to the powers of the Deputy so appointed. The more ordinary course in case of the absence of the Lieutenant was to appoint Lords Justices to hold his place; but, even so lately as the lieutenantancy of Strafford, we meet an example of the Lord-Deputy Wandesford holding office during Strafford's absence; and when, on the death of Wandesford, Sir John Parsons and Borlase were appointed as Lords Justices, a long and difficult controversy was raised as to their powers in reference to holding or continuing a Parliament in virtue of a commission which had been issued to the Lord-Deputy or Lord-Lieutenant.§

\* P. 64.

† Life of Ormond, i., Introduction, p. xxvii.

‡ *Ib.*, p. xxviii.§ *Ib.*, i. p. 119.

The first viceroy of Ireland is commonly held to have been Hugh de Lacy, who was appointed by Henry II. in person during his expedition to Ireland in 1171-2. His appointment was made by the ceremony of investiture with the sword and cap of maintenance; and in a charter executed at Wexford, granting to him the land of Meath, the king styled him his "Baillé;"—a Norman title used to designate the representative of a king or seigneur, invested with judicial and executive authority. The territory comprised in the grant is estimated to have covered 800,000 acres, comprehending Meath, Westmeath, with parts of the King's County and Longford; but, like all the early grants in Ireland, and very many of those of later date, it was little more than nominal, the grantee being left to his own resources in making good the proper title thus assigned to him.

There is little of special interest in the history of any of the early viceroyalties, all of them brief, and, to some extent, irregular, or, at least, ill-defined—of FitzGislebert (commonly known as Strongbow), of Raymond le Gros, or Fitz-Adelm de Burgh. The direct relations of the office of Viceroy to the Crown might seem likely to have been modified by the creation of John as "Lord" of Ireland; but after the brief and inglorious period during which he himself held the government, it does not appear that any change took place in the nature or the functions of the office. There is more of incident in the viceroyalties of De Courcy and of the younger de Lacy.

The feud between these two Anglo-Norman potentates is but the prototype of numberless incidents in the later history of the English "conquerors" in Ireland. De Courcy, who had obtained a grant of Ulster from Henry II., and had for some years been actively engaged in an attempt to establish himself in his principality, was appointed viceroy at the close of 1185, on the return of Prince John to England, and held the office until 1189, the year in which Henry II. died. Under Richard the office was held in succession by the younger Hugh de Lacy, by William Le Petit, by William, Earl Marshal of England, by Pierre Pipard, and by Hamon de Valognes, who governed from 1197 till 1199, and whose viceroyalty furnishes one of the earliest examples of what was not unfrequent in later times,—a compulsory payment on resigning his task before obtaining acquittance of his viceregal accounts. De Valognes was obliged to pay a thousand marks to the king at the close of his viceroyalty.

During the reigns of Henry II. and Richard I. the Viceroy had a two-fold relation—namely, to the king as sovereign, and to John as lord, that title having been vested in him in 1177:

and a curious speculation has been raised as to the state of things which might have arisen had Richard I. left heirs in the direct line. If the "lordship" were not merely a personal dignity, it ought to have followed the right of descent in the family of John; and thus might have arisen a case somewhat analogous to that which has occurred in the succession of the present Royal Family of England as to their hereditary kingdom of Hanover; inasmuch as, while the crown of England would of course have followed the line of the family of Richard I., the descendants of John might have claimed the Anglo-Norman territories in Ireland as their separate "lordship" or dominion. By the death of Richard without heirs, however, the two dignities were united in the person of John, and (except in the short interval during which Henry III., in 1254, assigned to his son Edward, on his marriage with Eleanor of Castille, portions of Ireland and Wales, and during which Ireland was officially described as "the land of the Lord Edward") his successors upon the throne of England continued to bear conjointly with their royal title, that of Lord of Ireland, down to the time of Henry VIII., who, in 1542, caused himself to be proclaimed "King" of Ireland.

John's first viceroy was Meyler Fitz-Henry, so called on account of his illegitimate descent from Henry I.; but his period of office is of small interest, compared with that of his successor, Hugh de Lacy the younger, who had already been viceroy under Richard in 1189. De Lacy's second viceroyalty is memorable, on account of his feud with De Courcy, already alluded to. This remarkable man had early distinguished himself in the Anglo-Norman ranks in Ireland; he was a man of huge proportions and gigantic strength, and Cambrensis quaintly says, that "any one who had seen him with his sword lopping off heads and arms might well have commended his might." The grant of the territory of Ulster, already mentioned, made to him in reward of his services by Henry II., was accompanied with the title of Earl; and although no copy of the original instrument confirming the earldom has been preserved, this title is generally regarded as the earliest Irish title conferred upon any Anglo-Norman. De Courcy himself, in the latter years of Henry II., had held the office of Viceroy; and both then and subsequently had been engaged in a contention with De Lacy, the Lord of Meath, which came to a crisis during the second viceroyalty of that noble. The causes of conflict are thus detailed by Mr. Gilbert:—

In this territory of "Ulidia," as Down and Antrim were formerly named, De Curci exercised supreme authority, surrounded in almost regal state by a staff of officials, including his constable, seneschal, and chamberlain. Like

some of the high nobles in his native France, he also coined money in his own name, specimens of which, in silver, have recently been found in the county of Down, bearing the inscription "Joan de Curci." Complaints against the exactions of De Curci were carried to John before 1202; while his rivals, the De Lascies, whose lands in Meath and Connaught bordered on his territories, accused him of disloyalty to the King. In 1202, the viceroy, Hugues de Lasci, attempted treacherously to seize De Curci at a friendly conference to which he had invited him. Escaping, by force of arms, from this snare, he was met by the viceroy's brother, Gaultier de Lasci, who, by professions of friendship, induced him to accept shelter in a castle which he held as his liegeman. Here, by a breach of fealty, he was detained in durance, till liberated to arrest the ravages of his retainers, who devastated De Lasci's lands with fire and sword. Aided by the powerful clan of O'Neill, and by soldiery from Man and the Isles, De Curci waged war against the viceroy, Hugues de Lasci, whom he defeated in a battle at Down, in 1204. In the latter year, John directed Gaultier de Lasci and Meiller Fitz-Henri to summon De Curci to come in on a day fixed by them and the Council, as he regarded his allegiance and the hostages which the King held from him. The court was directed to pronounce judgment on the Earl, should he not appear on the day named; and in event of forfeiture being decreed, the King ordered a transfer, to Gaultier and Hugues de Lasci, of eight cantreds of De Curci's lands, nearest to their territories in Meath, to be held on terms stipulated by the Crown with them. John also warned the Barons of Ulster, holding under De Curci, that if they did not cause their lord to appear in person within the prescribed term, he would confiscate their lands, and deal severely with their hostages.

The story, however, is embellished with a variety of legendary adjuncts :—

In the legends of the colonists these transactions were embellished with the following romantic details :—De Curci, after having been defeated in an engagement, challenged the viceroy, Hugues de Lasci, to single combat; but the representative of the King declared that he would not hazard his life with a traitorous subject, and proclaimed a large reward for bringing him in alive or dead. This proving ineffective, the Viceroy bribed De Curci's servants, who enabled him to surprise their master, unarmed, while performing his devotions at the Church of Down, on Good Friday. With the pole of a cross, snatched from the head of a grave in the churchyard, De Curci slew thirteen of De Lasci's soldiers, but was at length overpowered and sent in fetters to the Tower of London. The treacherous servants, having received their promised reward, solicited letters into England, setting forth their good service, which were granted, on condition that, under pain of death, they should never return to Ireland, nor open the writings till demanded from them. From the viceroy they received a bark with sails and victuals, but he refused to allow them to take either pilots or mariners. Thus, driven by the winds along the coast, they were seized at Cork and hanged together; as, on opening their sealed letter, it was found to denounce them as damned traitors, who, having sold their master to his enemies for money, should

not be received or harboured. After he had lain long a prisoner in a squalid dungeon of the Tower of London, De Curci was liberated, on condition of meeting in single combat a famous foreign champion, whom no warrior in England dared to encounter. On entering the lists, the champion, dismayed at De Curci's size, declined to engage, alleging that he expected to meet a man—not a giant. De Curci, invited by the King, who was present, to give some proof of his strength, clove, with one blow, a steel helmet and shirt of mail, driving his sword so deep into the stake on which they were placed, that none but himself could draw it forth. According to the romances, De Curci subsequently made fifteen attempts to revisit Ireland, but was strangely repulsed by contrary winds on each occasion. The records, however, show that De Curci came to Ireland in 1210, in the service of King John, from whom he was in receipt of an annual pension. He would appear to have died towards 1219, as in that year Henry III. ordered payment of the dower due to his widow Affreca out of the lands which her late husband had held in Ireland. Affreca died in "Grey Abbey," in the county of Down, which she had endowed in 1193, for Cistercians from Cumberland. The remains of her effigy, carved in stone, with hands clasped in prayer, were, in the last century, to be seen in an arch of the wall on the gospel-side of the high altar, amid the ivy-covered ruins of the large and once sumptuous "Grey Abbey," on the eastern bank of Cuan, now Strangford Lough.

De Curci, according to his contemporary Cambrensis, had no children by his wife; but the peerage compilers of the last century set him down as father of Milo de Curci, to whom Henry III. granted the barony of Kinsale. The right claimed by the Barons of Kinsale to stand covered in the presence of the Monarchs of England, was, according to the same peerage authorities, originally granted to Jean de Curci by King John, on the occasion of his meeting the foreign champion.

The king was careful, in those days of precarious fidelity, to require from the viceroy a guarantee of good faith, the ordinary form of which was the giving up as hostages his own sons, or those of his kinsmen or retainers. Mr. Gilbert has enumerated, from a contemporary document, the hostages thus given by Hugh de Lacy to John. They were chiefly from the families of the barons who held under De Lacy in Meath; and they were assigned in custody to divers nobles in the service of the king in England. Thus Hugh de Lacy, son of Robert de Lacy, was placed in the custody of Henry Biset; Hugh de Tuyt (Tuite) was sent in custody to Winchester; Robert, son of William de Petit, was placed in the hands of William Earl Marshal; Maurice, son of Hugh Hosee (Hussey), was given into the charge of John Fitz-Hugh, at Windsor; and Adam, son of Richard de Chapelle, was placed in the castle of Salisbury. And again, on the part of the viceroy, the same system of guarantee was carried through the subordinate ranks of the administrative system; hostages being exacted by the viceroy from the barons and from the native chiefs who entered into



engagements with the king, either to be retained in the custody of the viceroy during pleasure, or to be committed to the charge of responsible guardians.

The earliest notice which has been discovered of the salary or "entertainment" assigned to the viceroy occurs in the letters patent dated Westminster, July 4, 1226, by which an annual salary of £580 is assigned to Geoffrey de Marreis. The value of this allowance may be estimated from the prices ordinarily current a little before this period, which are stated by Mr. Gilbert as follows:—

French wine, three to six pence per gallon; fat hogs, from two to four shillings each; wheat, two shillings; and oats, one shilling per quarter. The knights of the King of England received two shillings daily, while the wages to cross-bowmen and sailors were from three to six pence per day. As an illustration of the communication in those times between the islands, it may be noticed, that King Henry, in 1226, ordered the keeper of the royal forest near Bristol to purvey venison to his Justiciary, Geoffroi de Marreis, and his attendants, while awaiting at that port a fair wind for Ireland.

Stephen de Foleburne, Bishop of Waterford, and afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, acted as viceroy from 1276 to 1282, partly by direct authority of the king, partly as deputy of Sir Robert d'Ufford. His allowance as justiciary was £500 yearly. In the beginning of the following century the salary appears to have been fixed at the same amount; but the viceroy, in addition to this and other emoluments of office, had the right to levy provisions of all kinds for the supply of his troops and household at what was known as "the king's price"—a rate far below the current value, and calculated on such a scale as might enable him to live upon his salary, and the soldiers on their pay.\* The maintenance of an armed force formed one of the capital obligations of the viceregal office:—

Each viceroy was usually bound, by his patent of office, to maintain a special body of nineteen fully equipped horse-soldiers (he, as their commander, being officially regarded as the twentieth of this troop), always in readiness for military service, on behalf of the Crown of England. The viceroys also frequently entered into compacts with captains of free bands of soldiery. These leaders, in consideration of being retained in the vice-regal service, with lodgings, rations, and attire, engaged to serve the viceroy in Ireland, during his life, at all times and seasons, against every man except the King, or their own immediate feudal lords, and to bring, whenever summoned, a body of troopers well armed and mounted. The usual pay of such captains was one shilling per day, for each fully caparisoned horse supplied by them,

---

\* P. 120.

with sixpence per day for provender, when they could not forage upon the country; in addition to which, they and their men were entitled to receive "bouche en court," or free diet with the vice-regal retinue.

The castle, in those times, was defended by a garrison of archers and halberdiers, the chief officers being the constable, the warders, the guardian of works and supplies. In the fourteenth century, the warder was paid the yearly wages of forty-five shillings and sixpence. The constable, frequently a nobleman of high rank, received an annual salary of £18. 5s., or one shilling per day, and, as constable of the King's chief castle in Ireland, he was entitled, under a special enactment, to take from prisoners higher fees than those paid to a similar officer in any other castle in the kingdom. The value of such payments may be illustrated by the following prices, usual, about this period in the Anglo-Norman settlement in Ireland:—cows, from 5s. to 13s. 4d. each; heifers, 3s. 4d. to 5s.; sheep, 8d. to 1s.; ordinary horses, from 13s. 4d. to 40s.; pigs, 1s. 6d. to 2s.; salmon, 6d. each; while wheat, corn, and malt varied in rates with the produce of the seasons.

The "entertainment" of the viceroy was payable at the Exchequer, Dublin, of which department of public administration a curious account is given by Mr. Gilbert:—

The Exchequer, amongst its other business, received and disbursed the Crown revenues, which arose mainly from the royal demesnes, farms of towns, fines, customs, treasure trove, and casual profits. The computations in this court were made by counters, laid in rows upon the several distinctions of the chequered cloth covering the table; and squared hazel rods, notched in a peculiar manner, styled "tallies" and "counter tallies," were employed as vouchers. An ancient drawing of the Exchequer of the King of England, at Dublin, in the fourteenth century, is preserved in the manuscript known as the "Red Book" of that court. At the top of this sketch are represented six persons, apparently officers of the court; to the left are three judges; at the right, three suitors; and a sheriff is seated at the bottom. To the right, at the head, is the crier, in the act of adjourning the court, exclaiming "A demain." The officer to the left, probably the second Remembrancer, holds in his hands a parchment, containing the words, "Preceptum fuit Vice-comiti, per breve hujus Scaccarii." The Chief Remembrancer, at his right, examines a pen, and holds an Exchequer roll, commencing, "Memorandum quod x<sup>o</sup> die Maij," &c.; while the "Clerk of the Pipe" prepares a writ, placed on his left knee, his foot resting upon the table. To the extreme left, the Marshal of the Exchequer addresses the usher, and holds a document inscribed, "Exiit breve Vice-comiti." One of the three judges at the side of the table exclaims, "Soient forlez;" while another cries, "Voyr dire." On the chequered-covered table, before the judges, are the "Red Book," a bag with rolls, the counters used for computation, and a document commencing with the words "Ceo vous," &c. At the bottom is seated a sheriff, bearing upon his head the leathern cap, worn by such officers while undergoing examination in the Exchequer respecting their accounts. Of three suitors, standing at the right of the picture, one, with uplifted hand, says, "Oy de brie;" another, extending his arm, cries, "Chalange;" while the



third, with sword at his side, laced boots, and ample sleeves, holds the thumb of his left hand between the fore and middle finger of his right, and exclaims, "Soit oughte."

The royal treasure was deposited in the Castle of Dublin, in charge of the treasurer and two chamberlains of the Exchequer, in a coffer with three different locks, encircled by a leather strap, sealed by the treasurer; and as each of these officials had the custody of one key, no payment could be made unless in the presence of the entire three. By an ordinance of Edward I., the accounts of Gascoigne, and of the issues and receipts of the King's land of Ireland, were to be rendered yearly at the Exchequer in England, before the treasurer and barons—the former by the constable of Bordeaux, and the latter by the treasurer for Ireland, vouched by the counter-rolls of the chamberlains. In Ireland, as in England, the Crown revenues and customs of the colony were frequently mortgaged or farmed out by Edward I. and his two successors to associations of Italian money-dealers, as security for repayment of loans and advances obtained from them. The principal companies engaged in this traffic were the "Ricardi" of Lucca and the "Frescobaldi" of Florence, whose agents and collectors were stationed in the chief towns in Ireland.

As the office of Viceroy was held during the king's good pleasure, the term of its tenure was very variable; but it frequently happened that the same person was appointed a second, and some, as in the case of Geoffrey de Marreis and John Fitz-Geoffrey, a third time. Nor are there wanting instances in which the Viceroy exchanged his cap of maintenance for the monastic cowl, and, like Geoffrey de Joinville, ended his career as a monk in some monastery which he had founded in the days of his worldly greatness. It is remarkable, too, that several of the most prominent among the great families by which the first military adventure was organized and carried out, did not continue to enjoy, in the proportion of their services, the honour of representing their sovereign among the people upon whom they had striven to impose his sovereignty. The list of viceroys comprised in the period which Mr. Gilbert's first volume embraces, contains very many names entirely unknown in the early years of the conquest; while, on the other hand, the three great families of De Lacy, De Ridelsford, and Maréchal, had all become extinct in the male line before the middle of the thirteenth century.

The actual geographical limits of the authority of the English Viceroy in Ireland is a subject of much difficulty, and one regarding which the most vague and inaccurate ideas have prevailed. One palpable source of this uncertainty is the very fluctuation of the boundary-line, the position of which was often so precarious that it could hardly be regarded as fixed from one day to another. Mr. Gilbert, in the opening of his fourth chapter,

lays down very intelligibly the geography of the Anglo-Norman territory as it stood about the close of the first century of English occupation; and he explains in connection therewith many fiscal, executive, and social details, with so much accurate learning, that we cannot help transcribing the passage, which, although quite free from all parade of erudition, is evidently the fruit of much careful research.

Towards the commencement of the fourteenth century, the portions of Ireland nominally under the dominion of the English Crown were divided into "Liberties," and the following ten counties: Dublin, Louth, Kildare, Waterford, Tipperary, Cork, Limerick, Kerry, Roscommon, and part of Connaught.

The "Liberties," the lords of which exercised high authority, assuming the state of princes, were those of Connaught and Ulster, under De Burgh; Meath, one moiety of which was assigned to De Mortimer, and the other to De Verdon; Wexford, Carlow, and Kilkenny, each under the jurisdiction of the respective representatives of the husbands of the Maréchal heiresses; Thomond or North Munster, partly claimed by De Clare; and Desmond, or West Munster, over which a branch of the Fitz-Geralds had, through arms and intermarriages, acquired partial domination. "These absolute palatines," wrote Sir John Davies, "made barons and knights; did exercise high justice in all points within their territories; erected courts for criminal and civil cases, and for their own revenues, in the same form as the King's courts were established at Dublin; made their own judges, seneschals, sheriffs, coroners, and escheators; so as the King's writ did not run in those counties (which took up more than two parts of the English colonies), but only in the church lands lying within the same, which were called the "Cross," wherein the King made a sheriff; and so in each of these counties palatines, there were two sheriffs: one of the Liberty, and another of the "Cross." . . . These great undertakers were not tied to any form of plantation, but all was left to their discretion and pleasure; and although they builded castles, and made freeholders, yet there were no tenures or services reserved to the Crown; but the lords drew all the respect and dependency of the common people unto themselves." On most of these lands, many native septs still existed, either tributary or alternately in alliance with, or opposed to, the Anglo-Norman lords. The borders, styled "Marches," between the Anglo-Norman territories and those almost entirely occupied by the natives, were continually traversed by the hostile clans, who assailed the castles, encountered the garrisons and the troops of the district, carrying off their spoil and prisoners through the woods, mountain passes, and morasses, whither the heavily-armed foreigners were unable to pursue them with success. To check sudden inroads, it was enacted that landholders near the "Marches" should keep horses caparisoned, and arms ready, to sally forth when an alarm was given, by day or night. Harassed by the natives, and disregarded by absentee proprietors, the colonists also suffered in the warfare, which continuously prevailed, between the resident Anglo-Norman lords, who enforced all the severities of feudalism on their

dependants. The Irish, meanwhile, were governed by the minute Gaelic code, administered by their brehons or judges, according to ancient precedent.

The most important Anglo-Norman royal castles in Ireland, after that of Dublin, were those of Athlone, Roscommon, and Randown, the garrison of each of which, commanded by a Constable, was paid and supplied with arms and provisions out of the revenues of the colony. Various fortresses had also to be maintained for the defence of the county of Dublin, some of which, about this period, were partly garrisoned by soldiery from Wales, experienced in irregular warfare, numbers of whom fell in the contests with the Irish.

On many occasions, the clans advanced to the gates of Dublin, on the battlements of the Castle of which usually were displayed the heads of those who had been slain in their conflicts with the troops of the colony; but some of the settlers had commenced to adopt the native habits and manners so completely, that they were occasionally taken for, and treated as, Irish enemies. Various enactments, dealing with this state of things, were made in assemblies, styled "Councils," or "Parliaments," constituted of ecclesiastical and lay Anglo-Norman representatives, presided over by the Viceroy. When Edward I. made a pressing appeal to his subjects in Ireland, for aid for his Scottish war, the Viceroy, Wogan, before the meeting of the Parliament, in 1300, having personally conferred with the provosts and burgesses of the cities and boroughs, prevailed on them to make grants individually; obtaining thus money from some, five hundred-weight of fish, value five pounds, from others; and, in some cases, both fish and money.

The cities designated "royal," holding charters directly from the Crown of England, were Dublin, Waterford, Limerick, and Cork. The customs and Crown revenues of Limerick were considerably exceeded by those of the remote Galway, the castle of which was the residence of the powerful De Burghs, Lords of Connaught and Earls of Ulster, by whom the interests of the town were promoted and fostered. Although thus protected, and encircled by strongly-fortified walls, Galway was obliged to pay an annual tribute to the clan of O'Brien, of Tromra, in Thomond, for the defence of its harbour and trade; and from the town of Dundalk, on the eastern coast, to the north of Dublin, a similar impost was levied by the sept of O'Hanlon. Most of the other towns appertained to the representatives of the Anglo-Norman lords of the Liberties in which they stood, or to the clergy: Ross, to Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, husband of Matilda Maréchal; Youghal, to Gilbert Fitz-Thomas de Clare; Clonmel, to Otho de Grandison; Botavaunt, or Buttevant, to David de Barry; Cashel, to its Archbishop; Inistiogue and Athassel, to the priors of the Augustinian monasteries there.

The complete isolation from each other of the two races thus locally separated is so familiar to the student of general Irish history, that it need not be referred to here; but Mr. Gilbert supplies, in various portions of his volume, many

curious illustrations of the complete independence of the "Irishry" in those districts which they had maintained against invasion, or which, from time to time, they wrested back from the Saxon. Of these the system of quasi-tributary payment by which the hostility of the native chiefs, especially in the border districts, was purchased off, is, perhaps, the most curious. Thus, during the Viceroyalty of James le Botiller, third Earl of Ormond, in 1377, we find a royal warrant directing that Art Mac Murrough Kavanagh should be paid the fee of eighty marks, which he demanded as the price of peace. O'Connor of Offaly was subsidized at the same time; and almost immediately afterwards, while a Parliament, guarded by English soldiery, was actually sitting at Castle Dermot, Murrough O'Brien of Thomond, having advanced into Leinster, was only induced to return by a payment of a hundred marks. The strangest part of the transaction to modern eyes is the poverty of the Anglo-Irish exchequer at this crisis. Of the full sum of a hundred marks, the exchequer was unable to supply more than nine; and the remaining ninety-one were contributed by individuals, and that not in money, with the exception of the Prior of the Hospitallers, who paid down sixteen marks in cash, and Sir Robert and Sir Patrick De la Freyne, who contributed jointly seven marks and ten shillings in kind, or perhaps more correctly in the form of pledges. Thus, William Fitzwilliam gave a horse value twenty marks; John Fitzgerald a horse and cuirass, price twenty marks; Robert Lughteburgh a horse, price twenty marks; John More *a bed, value thirty shillings!* Of the same Earl of Ormond, nearly twenty years later, we find a royal writ, authorizing the repayment to him of £46. 13s. 4d. paid by him to the son of Murrough O'Brien, as the price of his withdrawing his troops from Leinster. At the time of the accession of Edward IV. these payments appear to be reduced to a settled and recognized system, probably graduated according to the necessities of the particular district of English territory, and to the strength or the menacing attitude of the native sept, whose neutrality it was desired to secure. Thus Meath and Kildare paid to O'Connor of Offaly, eighty pounds; Kilkenny and Tipperary, to O'Carrol, forty pounds; Limerick, to O'Brien, forty pounds; Cork, to Mac Carthy, forty pounds. Wexford contributed yearly forty pounds to Mac Murragh, who was also annually paid a salary of eighty marks at the English exchequer at Dublin. The settlers in the barony of Lecale, on the Ulster coast, and those of Uriel, or Louth, paid an annual "black rent" of

sixty pounds to O'Neill; and with the object of propitiating the head of that clan, King Edward sent him, with other presents, a collar of gold, bearing the royal badge of the House of York.

This regular and established system of levying black mail was probably confined to the native Irish. But it frequently happened in special emergencies that it was only by subsidizing the more powerful Anglo-Irish lords, and even the English municipalities of the purely Anglo-Norman towns and cities of the coast, that the viceroy was enabled to command their assistance in the straits to which the hostility of the native septs reduced him. In a rising of the Irish of west Ulster in 1423, Sir William De Burgh refused to move to the rescue unless upon a payment of £40. His brother was paid half that sum on the same occasion, and a corresponding grant, the amount of which is not specified, was made to the mayor and burgesses of Dublin.

Even the Church was forced occasionally to pay its share of those or similar exactions. A curious instance is recorded, in which an archbishop of Armagh, John Mey, only obtained from the O'Neill permission to enter his diocese on payment of "six yards of good cloth" for the chief himself, and three yards of the same material for his wife's tunic! The much more common state of things was that the English ecclesiastics were forced to abandon their establishments on the frontiers, after having vainly attempted to maintain and fortify them against the hostile natives. When Ramon de Perellas, Señor de Seret, arrived with a safe-conduct of Richard II. to visit St. Patrick's Purgatory with a retinue of twenty men and thirty horses, the viceroy, who received him most honourably in Dublin, did his best to dissuade him from an enterprise which he declared to be most perilous in its nature. Ramon having, in despite of this caution, made his way to Armagh, the English archbishop, De Colton, repeated even more strongly the same warning; and, although Ramon accomplished his pilgrimage among the wild Irish, in all safety and honour, the incident is a curiously convincing illustration of the habitual state of feeling which prevailed between the races, and the complete isolation from each other of the territories which they severally occupied: and it enables us to understand the declaration of one of the viceroys, Sir William de Windsor, in the reign of Edward III., who, although he had been engaged in border warfare "for a longer period than any knight in the service of England, yet had never succeeded in penetrating beyond the borders sufficiently far to learn correctly the nature

of the interior of the country, or the condition of the native Irish."\*

Among the sources of strength to the persistent opposition offered to the English power by the native Irish, not the least important was the want of union among the English themselves, and the preference which, in many instances, from the earliest times, many of the English settlers manifested for Irish customs, and for the freedom from English feudalism which these customs implied. It not unfrequently happens that we find the viceroy actively engaged in hostilities with one or more of the mutinous Anglo-Normans. A still more normal condition of the Anglo-Norman nobles was that of declared feud with one another; and how far even ecclesiastics shared in the spirit of party and its consequent feuds, is curiously exemplified in the contest about jurisdiction between the English Archbishop of Dublin (John Lech) and the English Archbishop of Armagh (Walter Joise), which Mr. Gilbert has detailed, and which, retaining its vitality through all the conflicts of race and of creed of the darker days which succeeded, was revived in a form almost identical in the midst of the peril and gloom of the seventeenth century in Ireland.

Nor need it be matter of wonder that the separation of the English and Irish races in Ireland, and of the territories which they respectively occupied, should have been so complete, when it is considered that, in the eyes of the English law, the soil of Ireland was regarded as foreign, and that migration to Ireland was held to be an equivalent for the penalty, then in use, of *legal banishment*. The judges who, in the council at Nottingham, in 1388, declared the authority of the king superior to that of the laws, were condemned to exile for life in Ireland. Sir Robert Belknap, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, was sent to Drogheda; Sir Roger Fulthorpe and William Burgh, Justices of the King's Bench, were sent to Dublin; Sir John Casey, Chief Baron, and John Lockton, King's Serjeant, to Waterford; and Thomas Rushod, Bishop of Chichester, to Cork. And, on the other hand, curiously enough, yet with a certain consistency, the sentence of banishment from England was not held incompatible with the exercise of jurisdiction, even the very highest, within the realm of Ireland. When Piers de Gaviston, the favourite of Edward II., was actually under sentence of perpetual exile, the king nominated him his viceroy for Ireland with the most ample powers.

One of the most interesting portions of Mr. Gilbert's history is that in which he relates the well-known but im-

---

\* P. 241.



perfectly understood expedition of Bruce into Ireland. Mr. Gilbert traces out very clearly and naturally the course of events through which, out of the relations of the English crown with both sections of the population of Ireland—the native and the Anglo-Norman—there arose such a settled subject of conflict, and so abiding a spirit of disaffection, that both sections alike came gradually to rally round a standard which, without fully representing either, rested upon ground which was common to both. We had hoped for the same careful rendering of the history of the later episodes of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck; but although the incidents of both these curious stories are pleasingly related, and although all the requirements of the dramatic interest of the narrative are fulfilled, yet the events are not so clearly traced back to the causes in which each originated, and we fail to discover the same careful dissection of the peculiarly Irish relations of the contest, and the same skilful delineation of its results to the general history of the country.

There is no part of Mr. Gilbert's subject to which we can refer with more pleasure than his treatment of the old and familiar, but yet unexhausted, subject of the "Statute of Kilkenny." He has been careful to interweave in the general narrative every shred of the earlier Anglo-Irish legislation which bears upon the same subject; and there are few readers who will not be surprised to find how little there is in that famous statute, the theme of so much bitter denunciation, which had not been anticipated by earlier but fragmentary enactments, and how completely the laws of Kilkenny, instead of forming a novel code then first arbitrarily imposed, reflect the existing tone of the Anglo-Irish mind, and embody the spirit of the existing social system in English Ireland. These minor indications, anticipative of what was to come, are of course diffused over too large a range of the history to be enumerated here, even in outline; but they will well repay the pains of a careful study, and are plainly the fruit of long and systematic original research. We must be content with presenting to the reader Mr. Gilbert's summary of the Kilkenny statute itself, which is much more complete and more intelligible than the meagre abstract which is to be found in the popular essays on the subject. It is hardly necessary to say that the parliament from which this enactment emanated was held in Kilkenny in Lent, 1367, during the Vice-royalty, in many respects a notable one, of Prince Lionel, Duke of Clarence, the son of Edward III.; but it is right to call special attention to the circumstance that the measure certainly was the result of the free deliberation of the Parliament itself, and not an



arbitrary enactment dictated by the Crown, or emanating in any way from alien influences.

On the grievous complaints of the Commons, and for the maintenance of the limited territories in Ireland remaining under the jurisdiction of the English Crown, a series of ordinances were enacted, at a Parliament of the chief ecclesiastical and lay colonists, presided over by Duke Lionel, at Kilkenny, in the first week of Lent, 1367. This statute, embodying much of the previous colonial legislation, commenced by setting forth that "many of the English of Ireland, discarding the English tongue, manners, style of riding, laws, and usages, lived and governed themselves according to the mode, fashion, and language of the Irish enemies; and also made divers marriages and alliances between themselves and the Irish enemies, whereby the said lands, and the liege people thereof, the English language, the allegiance due their lord, the King of England, and the English laws there, were put in subjection and decayed, and the Irish enemies exalted and raised up, contrary to reason."

These Kilkenny enactments professed to deal solely with the English in Ireland, and the Irish who resided amongst them under the dominion of England. Over the clans, then occupying about three-fourths of the island, these legislators did not attempt to assume an authority which they would have been entirely unable to enforce; and throughout the document, the natives, whether hostile or at peace with the English, are referred to as the "Irish enemies." Of this "Statute of Kilkenny," which was long regarded as a masterpiece of legislation for the colony in Ireland, the following is a synopsis:—

Alliances by marriage, gossipred, fostering of children, or other connections between English and Irish, or selling to the latter, in time of peace or war, horses, armour, or victuals, were declared treasonable. All Englishmen, or Irish living amongst them, were to use the English language, be called by English names, follow the English customs, and not ride otherwise than in saddles, in the English manner. If ecclesiastics dwelling amongst the English did not use the English language, the profits of their benefices were to be seized by their superiors; but, adds the statute—which was written in French, the language of the upper classes of England—"they shall have respite to learn the English tongue, and to provide saddles, between this and the Feast of St. Michael next coming." That English should not be governed in the determination of their disputes by Brehon law, or the law used in the "marches" or borders. That no Irishman should be admitted into any cathedral, collegiate church, or benefice, by promotion, collation, or presentation; and that religious houses should not receive Irishmen into their profession. That the English should neither admit nor make gifts to Irish musicians, story-tellers, or rimers, who might act as spies or agents. That dwellers on the borders should not, without legal permission, hold parleys or make treaties with any hostile Irish or English. That differences should not be made between English born in England and English born in Ireland, by calling the former "English Hobbes," or clowns, and the latter "Irish dogs;" and that religious houses should receive Englishmen, without

considering whether they were born in England or Ireland. That English subjects should not war upon each other, nor bring Irish to their assistance for such purpose. That the common people, dwelling on hostile borders, should not use the plays called hurlings and quoitings, which had caused evils and maims, but accustom themselves to draw bows and cast lances, and other gentlemanlike sports, whereby the Irish enemies might be the better checked. That wars commenced under the sanction of the Government should not be terminated until the Irish enemy had been finally destroyed or had made restitution, or paid fines; and that hostages should be executed if hostilities were renewed in violation of treaties. That there should be but one peace and one war throughout all the land of the King of England in Ireland; so that if any Irish or English made a hostile inroad, the surrounding counties should attack and harass them on their borders, when summoned by the sheriffs or wardens, and that English should not break any peace legally made between Irish and English. That to resist the Irish, there should be appointed in every county four of the most substantial men as wardens of the peace, with power to assess the inhabitants for providing horsemen-at-arms, hobelers, and foot soldiers, who were to be reviewed by them from month to month. That constables of castles, with the exception of the constable of the King's chief castle in Ireland, at Dublin, should not take from any prisoner a fee of more than fivepence; and that they should not use cruelties for the purpose of extortion. That none should keep kerns or hired soldiery on the lands of others, to aggrieve the people, but maintain them, at their own expense, on their borders. Against violators of these and other enactments concerning the internal government of the colony, penalties of death, imprisonment, and forfeiture of property were decreed; and for the maintenance of the provisions of the Statute, a commission was ordered to hold inquiries twice a year. The Archbishops of Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, and the Bishops of Lismore and Waterford, Killaloe, Leighlin, and Cloyne, took part in this Parliament. At the request of the Lord Lieutenant, nobles and commons, these prelates pronounced sentence of excommunication and the sentence of the Church against all who might, by rebellion of heart, act against the ordinances of the "Statute of Kilkenny."

On one branch of the curious relations of the native and foreign races in Ireland, which arose out of this or the earlier analogous legislation, and which, indeed, is itself mirrored out in its very legislation—we mean the condition and status, political as well as social, of the English who were resident in the Irish territory, and who lived according to Irish law and Irish custom, Mr. Gilbert will be found to supply much interesting information. Nor has any writer brought more distinctly into view a distinction among even the English who resided in the English territory, which has been very often overlooked—the "English by birth" and the "English by blood." Much of what he has written on this point appears to us both novel and judicious; as are his observations on the alternating influences which were exercised

upon the administration of the law, no less than on the legislation itself, by the fact that those who were charged therewith chanced to belong to one or to the other class. There is much still to be learned of the condition of the country by the reflected light of the legislation, which was the emanation, quite as much as the originating cause, of that condition, or perhaps of some obscure and unmentioned circumstance of it.

On the subject of parliaments in Ireland, Mr. Gilbert, without professedly entering into it, has collected much valuable incidental information, and an interesting essay might be framed from his pages upon the curiosities of early Irish legislation. There is one portion of the subject on which his remarks will be read with especial interest—the origin and the true intent of the celebrated Poynings' Law. Mr. Gilbert has shown very clearly that this well-known enactment was directed not against the interests of the Irishry properly so called, but much more directly against the interests of the English in Ireland; and that its true object was to establish a purely alien English control, to which even the English element of the Irish Pale should be subordinate. It was part of that profound and comprehensive policy which Henry VII. devised for his English no less than for his Irish dominions, and the effective working of which demanded the concentration of all power into one vigorous hand. Alarmed as well by the wide support accorded by the malcontent Anglo-Irish to Warbeck, as by the motive in which that support originated, Henry determined at the same time to cut off at a blow the foundations of Anglo-Irish independence, and to withdraw out of their hands the administration even of English interests in Ireland.

For these objects he filled all the high posts in the colony with English officials, entirely subservient to himself. In September, 1494, the King appointed, as Lieutenant for Ireland, during pleasure, his second son, then in his fourth year, subsequently Henry VIII. of England. As Deputy to the Prince, he nominated Sir Edward Poynnges, or Poynings, son of Robert Poynings and Elizabeth Paston, of the Norfolk family, whose collection of letters were published by Sir John Fenn. Poynings, a man of immoral private character, had actively supported the Tudor interest, was created by Henry VII. a privy councillor, knight of the Garter; entrusted with command in Flanders; and, in conjunction with Warham, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, employed on an embassy to the Emperor Maximilian.

Poynings was supported by a large array of English officials, and Mr. Gilbert's narrative of their administrative career in Ireland is the best illustration and the most signi-

ficant commentary upon the famous statute which formed its consummation.

With Poynings were associated the following English officials for the administration of the affairs of the colony : Chancellor, Henry Deane, Bishop of Bangor, in Wales ; Treasurer, Sir Hugh Conway ; Chief Justice of the King's Bench, Thomas Bowring ; Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, John Topcliff ; and Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Walter Evers. Poynings, accompanied by his wife, Elizabeth, landed at Howth on the 13th of October, 1494, with one thousand soldiers ; received the sword of office at Dublin ; caused his English associates to be sworn of the Privy Council, and issued writs convening a Parliament of the English subjects. Joining his forces with those of Kildare and Sir James Ormonde, Poynings marched towards Ulster, apparently with a view of penetrating into Donegal, the lord of which had recently been received with high honour, as "the great O'Donnell," at the Scottish Court, where conferences were held with James IV., on plans for obtaining the Crown of England for Warbeck, as representative of the house of York. The Deputy did not succeed in advancing beyond the border territories of O'Hanlon and Magennis. While engaged in devastating their lands with fire and sword, he was assured by Sir James Ormonde that his companion, Kildare, in concert with O'Hanlon and the Scots, had devised a plot against his life ; and intelligence also arrived that the Earl's brother had seized the King's castle of Carlow. Retreating from perils in Ulster, Poynings marched to Carlow, the English castle of which he found fortified and virtualled, under the command of James Fitz-Gerald, who set up the Kildare banner, and refused to surrender when summoned in the name of the King of England. After "a long and painful siege," the Deputy succeeded in reducing the fortress ; and on the 1st of December, 1494, the Anglo-Irish Parliament met at Drogheda.

From this assembly were absent the three chief Peers of the colony : Maurice, Earl of Desmond, in arms on behalf of Warbeck ; Gerald, Earl of Kildare, under charge of treason ; and Thomas, seventh Earl of Ormonde, resident in England. To facilitate the measures devised by Henry VII. for the subversion of the independence of the English legislature in Ireland, his officials secured the enactment of a statute revoking or resuming to the Crown of England every royal grant which had been made during the preceding one hundred and sixty-eight years. By this act the properties and titles of nearly all the Peers, chief personages, and corporations in Ireland, were placed completely at the King's disposal. The object of the act was nominally that of providing means to reduce the people to "whole and perfect obedience," by the repression and punishment of those who practised on "the innocent and true English subjects in the poor land of Ireland great and divers robberies, murders, burnings, and the universal, intolerable, and damnable extortion, as coigne, livery, and pay." In justification of the resumption under this statute, it was added that as the greater portion of the royal revenues was diminished and granted to divers persons, who, "for the most part, did full little service for the common weal," no other means were available to protect the land from being destroyed by the Irish enemies.

For the further subjection of the nobles, acts were passed decreeing that ordnance or great guns should not be kept in fortresses without Viceregal license ; that the cries of "*Crom abu !*" and "*Botiller abu !*" used by the Fitz-Geralds and Botillers, and other family war-shouts, should be discontinued. Instead of such cries, the subjects were enjoined to call upon St. George or the King of England. It was enacted that those who incited either English or Irish to war upon the Viceroy should be deemed guilty of treason ; that none but an Englishman should be admitted as Prior of the Hospitallers in Ireland, or entrusted with the custody of any royal castle there ; and that the exemption claimed by refugees in Ireland from English law should be annulled.

The Parliament confirmed the "Statute of Kilkenny," with the exception of the clauses against those who used the Irish language or rode in the Irish fashion. All subjects were ordered to provide themselves with cuirasses, salets, or helmets, English bows and sheaves of arrows ; each barony was to have two wardens of the peace ; every parish to be provided with a pair of butts ; and the constables were ordered to call the parishioners before them on holidays, to shoot, at least, two or three games. Under penalty of five pounds for each offence, the Lords spiritual and temporal were enjoined to appear in every Parliament in their Parliament robes, in like manner and form as the Lords of England. According to this statute, the English Lords of Ireland had, during the space of twenty or twenty-five years, "through penuriousness, done away the said robes to their own great dishonour, and the rebuke of all the whole land." A subsidy of 26s. 8d. was voted from every one hundred and twenty acres of cultivated land under English jurisdiction, for the purpose of reforming the "many damnable customs and uses" practised by the Anglo-Irish lords and gentlemen, under the names of "coigne, livery, and pay," described as "horse meat and man's meat, for the finding of their horsemen and footmen, together with fourpence or sixpence daily, to be paid to each, by the poor earth tillers and tenants," without any equivalent. The statute added that the many murders, robberies, raids, and other manifold extortions and oppressions, daily and nightly committed by these horsemen and footmen, were the principal cause of the desolation and destruction of the English land in Ireland, and had brought it to ruin and decay. According to this document, the most part of the English freeholders and tenants had departed to England, others had gone to strange lands, and the English lords and gentlemen had intruded upon their inheritances, occupying them as their own, and setting them to the King's Irish enemies. As a defence against the continuous incursions of the septs, it was enacted that the inhabitants on the frontiers of the four shires should, forthwith, build and maintain a double ditch, raised six feet above the ground, on the side which "meared next unto the Irishmen," on the marches or borders.

Of all the measures of the Poynings' administration, the most important in its prospective effect was that which prohibited the meeting of Parliaments in Ireland without license under the great seal of England ; and declared all statutes of Parliaments held in Ireland to be of no legal force, unless

previously approved by the Viceroy and Privy Council of Ireland, and moreover sanctioned by the King and Privy Council in England.

Perhaps the most curious characteristic of this memorable statute, still known as the Poynings' Act, was that it was popularly regarded by the Anglo-Irish at the time of its passing as a protection for the rights of the people against the encroachments of the Viceroy. We are tempted to transcribe Mr. Gilbert's account of the first Parliament, held under this celebrated Poynings' law, partly for the analogy which it bears with the Kilkenny legislation referred to in a former extract.

In March, 1498, Henry authorized Kildare to convene a Parliament which should not sit longer than half a year. This was the first Parliament held under "Poynings' law," in conformity with which the proposed ordinances were submitted by the Deputy and Council in Ireland to the King and Council in England, and, after their supervision, transmitted for adoption by the Colonial Legislature. By a legal anomaly, the attainder decreed against Kildare by the colonial lords and commons, at Drogheda, under the administration of Poynings, was still unrepealed in Ireland, when the King of England authorized the Earl to convene and preside over them as his representative. The first statute which this Parliament passed was a confirmation of the English reversal of the confiscation and attainder which had been pronounced against Kildare. The ordinance of Poynings' Parliament, superseding the "Statute of Henry Fitz-Empress," for the election of a temporary Governor by the Council, and directing the assumption of the Viceregal office by the Treasurer, was also repealed, as "divers great inconveniences, jeopardies, and charges had of late fortuned within the land." For these and other considerations, it was decreed that "whensoever the land of Ireland might happen to be void of a Lieutenant, Deputy, or Justice," it should be lawful to the Chancellor and Treasurer, or one of them, for the time being, if both were not present, calling to him the King's Council of Ireland, and the Lords spiritual and temporal of the four shires next adjoining, by their assent and that of the majority of them, to elect and nominate a Governor under the Great Seal for Ireland. This Justice, according to the act, was to have government and rule in the English King's name, and at his will, until his Highness should appoint a Lieutenant, Deputy Governor, or ruler, under the Great Seal of England. To the Governor, elected by the Council, power was only given to appoint, during the royal pleasure, officers for the administration of justice; to muster men for the defence of the English subjects; to levy the revenues, and to convert and spend them for the necessary protection of the English territories and people.

To prevent various evasions of the statute of absentees, the Parliament enacted that proprietors or holders of spiritual and lay offices who departed from Ireland to England or elsewhere, without license, should incur the forfeiture of one half of their property, to be expended by the viceroy in defences against the Irish. Another act prescribed that all laymen, married and dwelling within the "English Pale," should wear the English habit, and



that whensoever they rode to any journey or hosting, they should have and use for their defence "English artillery, as swords, bucklers, paveses, bows, arrows, bills, cross-bows, guns, and such hand-weapons." This statute recited that divers gentles and commons "drew them to idleness and used to wear Irish habit," and also "left the defence of bows and arrows, and took them to horsemanship, and to cast darts and spears, the which was one of the greatest causes of the desolation of the land : for when such persons went to the field with him who bore the King's state, when need should require, they neither could nor dare to cast dart or spear, because they had not the profound way and feat of it," the which, added the act, is a great "deceit for the King, and for any that beareth his estate, and for all the King's subjects." For the "increasing of English manners and conditions within the land, and for diminishing of Irish usage," it was ordained that every lord spiritual and temporal, and merchant, having livelihood or benefice to the yearly value of twenty marks, within the precinct of the English Pale, should ride in a saddle after the English guise, under pain of forfeiture of the horse and harness otherwise used. This penalty was not extended to persons riding, in the viceroy's company, to or from any hosting or journey in time of war.

The Sovereign and Portreve of Kenlis, the Portreves of Trim, Navan, and Ardee, and the Bailiffs of Dundalk, were ordered to cause and compel every merchant dwelling within these towns, to wear and use "gowns and cloaks ;" and to leave and put away the customable using of "huks and faldings ;" and to cause the walls of their towns to be "made and ditched," and the streets paved. Under the last statute of this Parliament, William Barry, "called the Lord Barry of Munster," and John Water, merchant of Cork, were attainted of high treason, for having, of late, at several times, received letters with certain instructions from Perkin Warbeck, which they concealed and still kept secret from the knowledge of the King and his council. Water was, in 1499, executed at Tyburn with Warbeck, to whom he had faithfully adhered.

With this perhaps too lengthened extract we must close, although we had noted many other subjects to which we should have desired to call the reader's attention.

We have altogether overlooked what to many will be the most attractive portion of the volume—the personal history of the viceroys, and the many other personal and social details with which the volume abounds. Mr. Gilbert's narrative of the celebrated case of Aleix de Kyteler (Alice de Ketteler) is full of most curious interest ; and of the work in general we may say, he has added largely from unpublished, and until recently, inaccessible sources, to our knowledge of what is properly the biographical branch of this important history. Of many of the viceroys who had heretofore been unknown except in name, Mr. Gilbert's sketches are wonderfully full and complete, and even of the most celebrated in the series



there are few to whose history he has not added something, or at least whose transactions he has not placed in a broader and more intelligible light. We shall look with much hopeful expectation for the continuation of this important work.

---

### ART. III.—THE FOUNDRESS OF THE FAITHFUL COMPANIONS OF JESUS.

*Vie de Madame de Bonnavault d'Houet, Fondatrice de la Société des Fidéles Compagnes de Jésus.* Par M. l'Abbé F. MARTIN, Missionn. Apost., Chan. Hon. de Belley.

THE saying that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church" has never been more triumphantly verified than in the religious revival in France since the first revolution. The seed that was then sown broadcast is now springing up with a vigour and redundancy of life, which is by some even deemed excessive. For example, the quick succession and rapid growth of religious congregations for every work of spiritual and corporeal mercy, is sometimes looked upon with a kind of suspicion, as if it implied too much of individual will, or betokened a restless craving for novelty. "Why so many different societies," we hear it said, "for doing the same work? Why cannot people be content with the old Orders?" As well might we ask, what need of beeches when we have oaks? What is the use of all the magnificent and multiform variety of the natural world? Why should not the whole earth be overspread by the monotonous shadow of a universal pine forest, instead of being clad in every beautiful variety of tint and foliage which can refresh the eye and gladden the heart of man? Why should the rocks be fringed with ferns, and the woods and meadows carpeted with flowers? Why, again, are no two leaves upon a tree alike, no two faces or two characters of men the same? The Spirit of God works no less wonderfully and sweetly in the spiritual than in the natural world. He there provides not only a remedy for every ill, a supply for every need, but a sphere also, and a home wherein every spirit may praise the Lord. Nevertheless, men grudge to see it. They would fain stamp the feeble impress of their own narrow and uniform designs upon the free action and boundless range of the creative energy of God, and say to the chainless ocean of his quickening and abounding love—"Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther." It is not often given to us

to behold, even in the history of the Church, such a fatherly and fostering care extended by an older to a younger religious society as was afforded by the great ungrudging generosity of the Sons of S. Benedict to the Family of S. Francis; or so sweet and brotherly a union as bound, and still binds, him and his children to the order of S. Dominic. Yet in the economy of His Providence, as marvellous in the order of grace as in that of nature, the Divine Ruler of the Church uses the timidity, and the human prudence, and even the narrow jealousy, which from time to time mingles with the true service of even faithful and devoted men, to work out His purposes of love, by stamping with His Royal signet of the cross the workers and the work on which they look with suspicion and distrust, and which He thus claims and acknowledges for His own.

Seldom have the arguments brought against the foundation of a new congregation worn a more specious appearance of reason than in the case of the society founded by the holy woman whose life is now before us. The daughters of the *Sacred Heart*, whose foundress has but now entered into her rest, were faithfully and successfully labouring in the same field which she was also inspired to enter. Her spiritual guides, who were also the directors of the recently-founded society, naturally inquired what purpose could be served by the foundation of another institute of which the rule and the work were to be so nearly the same; and prudently used every means of discouragement and severity which could test the spirit of the proposed foundress. Her humility and obedience were proved and perfected thereby; and the infant community struggled into life under a pressure of opposition and discouragement which must have stifled it, had it not derived its being from the Spirit of God.

The early training of the foundress of the Faithful Companions of Jesus had been a fit preparation for a noble and devoted life. Marie-Madeleine-Victoire de Bengy was the daughter of an ancient and honourable family in the province of Berri. At the period of her birth, 1781, her grandfather, the head of his ancient house, was a venerable old man, full of years and honours, the father of nineteen children, whose sons were serving their king and country with credit and distinction, in the various civil and military employments which were open in those days to the nobility alone. Sylvain-Charles-Pierre de Bengy, the third son of this venerable patriarch, married a woman of great piety and excellence. He distinguished himself in the career of arms, and was no less remarkable for his devotion to his religion than for his strength and decision of

character, and his exceeding tenderness of heart. Victoire, his eldest daughter, inherited both these gifts. In her early childhood her masterful force of will frequently gave uneasiness to her parents. It was a common saying in the family—"Whatever Victoire wills must be." Happily M. and M<sup>de</sup>. de Bengy had judgment and decision equal, with the aid of Divine grace, to the task of turning this strong will in the right direction. The devoted and reverential affection which Victoire bore to her pious parents throughout the whole course of her life betokens the success of the firm and loving discipline which had trained her childhood for God.

She had just completed her tenth year when the revolutionary storm broke upon France. M. de Bengy did not emigrate, but determined to weather it on a retired estate far in the country, whither he was accompanied by the Abbé Claveaux, a holy priest, under whose care Victoire had received her earliest religious training, and who now prepared her for her first Communion, which she received at his hands just before he was compelled to seek safety in exile. The necessity of the times obliged the family of de Bengy to live in poverty and obscurity, for which its members had been in a measure prepared by the Christian simplicity which had marked their more prosperous days. Madame de Bengy had early accustomed her daughter to wait upon herself, and she now found her an efficient assistant in the domestic labours which her altered fortunes compelled her to perform with her own hands. The child's sweetness and brightness of spirit made her the sunbeam of the house during those days of anxiety and fear, and the constant necessity of thinking for others, of warding off every needless care from the overburdened hearts of her parents, and aiding them in the training of the younger children, endowed her with a tact and discretion beyond her years. "She saw everything, she understood everything, she guessed everything, but she was taught (or rather inspired), with a discernment far above her age, to say only what was safe to be said, and to keep silence where silence was needful; so that nothing was ever concealed from her, nor did an imprudent word ever escape her lips."

Notwithstanding every precaution, the suspicion of the authorities fell upon M. de Bengy; he was arrested and thrown into prison, in those days the almost invariable preliminary to the death of the guillotine. Madame de Bengy, in the anguish of her heart, began a novena for his deliverance, in which she called upon Victoire to join her. Tenderly as the child loved her father, there was a feeling deeper and stronger still in her young heart. "I made the novena," said

she, in later years, "with all my heart; but it was to ask of God the grace to be imprisoned with my father, and to die a martyr. If my mother," added she, "had known my intention, she would not have thanked me."

The heroic prayer was granted, but not as she intended. M. de Bengy was restored to his family, and his daughter was reserved for a lingering sacrifice far more trying than the early martyrdom she had desired.

The days of terror passed away. M. de Bengy left his place of concealment, and with his family took up his abode at Issoudun. It was here that Victoire spent the happy days of her girlhood; here she began those charitable labours which, in one form or another, were to fill her future life. The hospital at Issoudun had been given over to the care of hireling nurses by the enlightened philanthropy which had suppressed the religious orders and scattered the Sisters of Charity. Mdlle. de Bengy and two young friends likeminded with herself devoted their mornings to the care of the sick. She was far, however, at this time from bearing the character which in France is called *dévoté*. She lived and dressed like other young ladies in the world, and danced with the energy of a true Frenchwoman, and, as she did everything else, with all her heart. It is recorded that one evening, as she left the house to go to a large party, she said to her younger sister, Angèle, "Say a 'Hail Mary' for me, that I may not miss a single dance." She was not endowed with any great degree of personal beauty; the great charm of her face consisted in its varying expression and the brilliancy of her eyes; but both in youth and age she was remarkable for a grace, sweetness, and vivacity, which made her conversation singularly attractive.

In 1804, at the age of twenty-three, Mdlle. de Bengy was married to Antoine Joseph, the eldest son of the Vicomte de Bonnault d'Houet, and went to reside with him at Bourges. Their union was as happy as it was brief. M. de Bonnault shared his wife's love for the poor. So lavish were their alms, that his father remonstrated with him upon the imprudence of an outlay disproportioned to his means. "Never fear," was the reply. "I lend my money at good interest." It was soon to be repaid. One only cloud ever shadowed the few bright months which Antoine de Bonnault spent with his young wife. One day as they were reading together the life of S. Jane Frances de Chantal, they came to the relation of her husband's death, on which the author remarks, that God had doubtless shortened his life in accordance with His own purposes for S. J. Frances. A cold shudder passed over

M. de Bonnault, as he exclaimed, "Alas! I too shall pay the price of an early death for the blessing of a wife like his." A few days afterwards he fell sick, and, after an illness of six weeks, fell asleep in the Lord, in July 1805. Two months afterwards, soon after the anniversary of her happy marriage, Madame d'Houet gave birth to a son, around whom all her affections entwined with the intense energy which belonged to her character. Her biographer acknowledges that at one time she spoiled him. She could not bear the sight of his tears, and he reached the age of five years without having been compelled to learn his letters. "This shrinking from giving pain, or administering reproof, was the weakness of a strong character." It clung to her to the last hour of her life. The woman who was commonly accused of being inflexible and positive had to fight a hard battle with herself whenever she was called upon to fulfil the duty of reproof or punishing another. A gentle remonstrance from her mother-in-law roused her to the necessity of mastering this weakness with regard to her child, and she accomplished it with characteristic determination. The following day, despite of tears and lamentations, the reluctant urchin was kept for five mortal hours at the task of deciphering his letters, and at the end of two months was able to read fluently any book which might be put into his hands. "This anecdote illustrates the character of Madame d'Houet. She might fall into error, but when the line of duty was once plainly before her, no power on earth could induce her to swerve from it."

From the period of her husband's death the light of Divine grace had been gradually leading her to that life of higher perfection in the world, which was to precede her vocation to religion. It was faithfully, though at first reluctantly, followed. One by one the links which bound her to the world were severed. The amusements of society, to which she had in a measure returned after the first period of her widowhood, lost their now feeble hold upon her, and were gradually laid aside. An act of heroic charity exercised in 1813 towards the Spanish prisoners crowded together in the hospitals at Bourges, seems to have been the stepping-stone to the life of higher sanctity and devotion to which she was eventually called. She disguised herself in a peasant's dress, in order to be able unobserved to aid the few Sisters of Charity whose services could be obtained for these poor strangers, who were fast dying of malignant typhus fever. Madame d'Houet caught the infection, and was brought to the gates of the grave, when she arose "with a hunger and thirst after justice," which made her after-life one unremitting endeavour after perfection.

The following words were found on a scrap of paper written by Madame d'Houet, a short time before her death :—

Pray for me, my dearest sisters, and grieve not for my death. I declare before God that I have done nothing in the formation of the Society of the Faithful Companions of Jesus, which has been wholly and absolutely the work of the Lord. I began it when it pleased Him, and without knowing what I was doing, nor what I desired to do. I beseech you, pray for me. I have nothing else to say to you, except to entreat you exactly to observe our Holy Rules, and never to suffer them to be changed in any point. The Lord will guide you himself as He has done from the beginning until now.

The gradual development of this work of the Lord, and the marvellous manner in which, by the unlikeliest means, and against both her own will and the will of her spiritual directors, He brought it to pass, forms the subject of the most interesting part of M. Martin's narrative. Not only was Madame d'Houet far from aspiring to the character of a foundress, not only was she for many years after her entrance upon the spiritual life devoid of any attraction to religion, but she felt an absolute repugnance to anything like a life-long engagement. Her desire was to sanctify her soul in the world by a life of interior recollection, devoting herself solely to the education of her son, and to such works of exterior charity as might be consistent with this first duty of her position. With this view, after she had placed him at the Little Seminary at Acheul, she passed much of her time at Amiens, in order to be near him. She was thus brought under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers, who were to be the means of fostering her vocation to a certain point, and then of exposing it to a trial of opposition which no work not of God could have surmounted. In the year 1816, the idea that God was perhaps calling her to religion, first presented itself to her mind, only to be hastily rejected. It returned again and again. She offered herself interiorly to do and to be whatever He should appoint for her. The thought of becoming a Carmelite then occurred to her mind, but an involuntary instinct warned her that this was not her vocation. At last, as she was beseeching our Lord with many tears to make known His will to her, "I had," she says, "a clear and sweet conviction that it was the will of God that I should enter religion,—not as I had once thought, in the Order of Mount Carmel, but in some society where I was to work for souls."

Madame d'Houet made known to her director, P. Varin, what had passed within her soul. "God," said he, joyfully, "has at last granted the prayers which I have so long been offering for you." And he at once suggested to her to enter



the Congregation of the Sacré Cœur, to which he believed God was calling her. "P. Varin had been one of the principal instruments employed by God in the foundation and development of this new congregation. His proposal, therefore, appeared quite natural, and in fact Madame d'Houet had sometimes entertained the same idea herself. But whilst he was speaking to her, an interior voice said decidedly, '*No, this is not to be.*'" Struck by her sudden change of countenance, P. Varin asked and received an explanation of it. He used all his influence to persuade her that she was under a delusion, but in vain; the words remained indelibly impressed upon her heart, and she could make no other reply but this, to the repeated remonstrances of her revered director, '*Father, what avails it that you will it, or that I will it, if God wills it not?*' And yet such was her dread of illusions, and her love of obedience, that she declares in her own narrative that she would have entered the Sacré Cœur at once if P. Varin had positively counselled her to do so. He dared not venture upon this."

These supernatural communications were now frequently repeated. "One Sunday," she says, "after Holy Communion, I distinctly heard a voice from the Tabernacle, which said to me, '*Ask of me what thou wilt.*' I reflected for a moment, and then said, '*My God, I desire nothing but the accomplishment of Thy holy will in me.*' The same words were again repeated. Then I thought of my son; but, after a moment's reflection, I said again, '*For him also I desire nothing but the accomplishment of Thy holy will.*' Then the same voice replied, '*Say with me, My God, I desire for my son and for myself only the accomplishment of Thy holy will. Give me grace to accomplish it as soon as it shall be made known to me.*'" Some time afterwards, on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, as she was waiting for Mass, she thought of the happiness of those who belong wholly to God, and have no other occupation but to love and converse with Him; and felt a regret that she had not been called to be a Carmelite. Suddenly she heard a voice from the crucifix, which said, "*I thirst.*" Deeply moved, she fell upon her knees, and offered herself to God with all her heart for whatsoever He should be pleased to require of her.

Our Lord vouchsafed gradually to make known His purpose, that she should found a congregation of women to labour for the salvation of souls, the rules of which were to be formed upon the constitutions of the Society of Jesus. She was also instructed that God required four things from her:—"1st, To be always united with God, and to do nothing but in close



union with Him. 2nd, To desire nothing but the accomplishment of His holy will. 3rd, To remain always in tranquillity under His hand, ready to do what he should require of me. I asked for a 4th rule, and was answered, 'To remain always in the presence of God, like an empty vessel, ready to receive whatsoever He shall be pleased to infuse into it.' The Holy Virgin," she continued, "was also shown to me as the Mother and Superioress of this society." Her directors began to grow uneasy at these extraordinary manifestations. P. Sellier, who directed her in the absence of P. Varin, sternly reprov'd her for giving credence to fancied revelations, and bade her lay aside all her projects. Madame d'Houet was but too glad to be relieved from the necessity of treading the steep and difficult ascent before her; she determined to resist with all her might every manifestation which could possibly lead her out of the ordinary path. But such was not the will of God. On the following day P. Sellier sent for her, and told her that our Lord had severely reprov'd him for the advice which he had given. "He bids me tell you," added he, "that all which has been said to you interiorly is true, and conformable to His holy will." At the same time, he foretold to her the opposition she was to meet with from his own Society, and even from himself. "But, Father," exclaimed she, "this is not possible; you will only pretend to oppose me." "No," said he, "I shall be really against you. God will change my mind, and make me see things as they are not." "Are you sure," persisted she, "that these things will happen?" "Yes, perfectly sure." "And do you know when it will be?" "Yes, I can tell you even this. Keep in mind the date of the day on which we are now speaking. Before the year is out your work will be begun." He added, "When the Jesuits begin to oppose you, take courage and reanimate your faith; it will be the day of the Lord's mercy towards you." "And yet, Father, you know I shall do nothing unless P. Varin approves it, and sets me to work himself." "He will set you to work," was the reply. "But mark my words, he will leave you as soon as you have begun." The following year was full of crushing trials and humiliations. P. Varin left no means untried to test the spirit of his penitent, in order to purify and intensify her purpose, if it were from God, or to quench it, should it be the offspring of self-will or diabolical delusion. She made a retreat, by his direction, at the Couvent des Oiseaux, at Paris, and remained there for some time afterwards under obedience to the Rev. Mother, who was directed by P. Varin to humble and try her with the greatest possible severity. Madame d'Houet thankfully accepted all these

painful means to the attainment of the end she so earnestly desired. "I have often," she says, "in my mind those words which our Lord addressed to His Blessed Mother: 'My Mother, become like unto me;' and those others in the Gospel: 'Be ye perfect as my Heavenly Father is perfect.' It seems to me that God calls me in a very special manner to imitate our Lord Jesus Christ, and to live in perfect union with Him; above all, to imitate His sweetness and humility. P. Varin says to me continually, 'Be little, be very little.' I cannot become so; I am still so great and so proud. One day he said to me, 'If you do not become less than a grain of mustard-seed, you will be good for nothing; not even to be cast into the dust of the way-side.' O my God, my Father, my good Master! Thou alone canst make me truly meek and humble. I beseech Thee to do so with my whole heart." After having again commanded his penitent to lay aside all thoughts of a project which he assured her was a delusion of the evil one, P. Varin, being probably convinced of its Divine inspiration by her heroic obedience, suddenly said to her, "I begin to believe that God does require something of you; go to Amiens; consult the PP. Foloppe and Sellier; they will write to me, and we will see how you are to begin."

The opinion of the two fathers was, that the work should be begun, but as quietly as possible. They recommended that a small house should be hired at Amiens, in which Mdme. d'Houet should take up her abode with one young person who offered to accompany her. Before a suitable dwelling could be found, Mdme. d'Houet was seized with an illness which had almost proved fatal. Her recovery was slow and tedious, and meanwhile the year was near its close, and the prediction of P. Sellier apparently far from its accomplishment. The last week had begun. "Notwithstanding her perfect resignation to the Divine will, her heart beat violently as the hope arose within her that it would pass away like the rest, without bringing any result." So strongly did her old natural repugnance arise within her, that she determined not to cross the threshold, except for confession, till the dreaded period should be past. In the Confessional P. Sellier opened not his lips on the subject. She returned home with a light heart, flattering herself that the danger was past; the burden seemed to have fallen from her shoulders, so that she might with a safe conscience look forward to a life of tranquillity; "For," said she to herself, "if P. Sellier's words do not come to pass, and I find that I have been once mistaken in what I took to be the voice of God, I shall know that I have been under an illusion all along." The thought had hardly passed through her mind

when a person stopped her in the street, with the information that a house which she had some time before refused, as beyond her means, was now to be had at half the price originally demanded. In three days the house with its furniture was bought, and two young persons, who were to be the associates of Mdme. d'Houet, established there.

The first prediction of P. Sellier was verified, the remainder were in due time accomplished. P. Varin had not only approved, but advised the purchase of the house; he was very far, however, from committing himself to anything farther. "When you have secured the house," he wrote to Mdme. d'Houet on the 10th of July, 1818, "we will ask our Lord what He would have done with it, since it belongs to Him; for the same reason, we will ask Him what He will do with His little handmaid, since she also is wholly His."

The two next years were passed in a wearing alternation of hope and fear, and of encouragement and severity on the part of her director. At one time he bade her attend solely to her personal sanctification; at another he renewed his proposal that she should enter the congregation of the *Sacré Cœur*. Its superioress, Mdme. Barat, added her persuasions to his, to induce Mdme. d'Houet to follow what they both believed to be the will of God for her. In vain did she endeavour to follow their counsels: the idea of a new congregation, which had pursued her for more than three years, was daily shaping itself more and more vividly before her, and assuming the form which it was eventually to bear. "She ceased not to pray for light upon this subject, and in prayer was continually recalled to her first idea of adopting the Jesuit rule, as far as it is practicable for women. 'God showed me,' said she, 'that in the society of Jesus is to be found the most absolute renunciation of self-will.' She then called to mind the opposition made to this project by her spiritual directors, who had told her that it would be displeasing to the Father General. 'And why should it displease him?' said she to herself, 'it is not him or his that we desire to follow, but Jesus Christ, the Leader and Master of them all. Our Divine Saviour received the holy women into His company, and they bore Him company faithfully to the end. From the cross he gave them His Heart, and His Mother. Outstripping the love of S. John, and the repentance of S. Peter, they were the first at the sepulchre, and the first to behold Jesus risen. They accompanied the Apostles to the cenacle, and left them not till they had together received the Holy Ghost. Who shall hinder us from following Jesus with the Holy Women? If we seek to imitate the sons of S. Ignatius, and, as far as possible, to adopt their rule, it is only because

they themselves imitate our Lord Jesus Christ.' Again—'When I was in prayer, I was filled with the sweet thought that Our Lord Himself would be the Director of our institute, and would guide it Himself. Then I earnestly besought Him to give us three things—His Spirit, His Heart, and his Mother. Still I wished to make a fourth petition. There seemed to be something very precious which I wanted still. Suddenly the Holy Name of Jesus came to my mind, and I joyfully besought Him to give us this also.' "

Such was the spirit which was to pervade the rising society; such was the blessed name which was to distinguish it in the Church—*Les Fidèles Compagnes de Jésus*. "It is an error to suppose that M<sup>me</sup>. d'Houet had borrowed this name from the Company of Jesus. An idea so narrow, so inexact in itself and in its expression, and which has been attributed to her as a mark of ambition, was far from her thoughts. What she asked from the Society of Jesus was its *rule*, as the instrument best adapted to the attainment of the glorious end before her."

It was not till the 20th of April, 1820, that M<sup>me</sup>. d'Houet finally took possession of the house which she had purchased two years before. Her two first companions had left her, and with the help of two other young persons sent to her by P. Varin, she now began her work of charity by the instruction of seven little girls sent to her by the sisters of S. Vincent. The beginning was humble enough, but even this feeble germ was to be trampled under foot before it could bring forth its destined fruit. Madame d'Houet was summoned to Bourges by the dangerous illness of her mother, when P. Sellier, under whose care she had left her infant community, fulfilled his own prediction by doing all in his power to destroy it. Madame de Bengy died a happy and holy death in the arms of her daughter, and left her a precious legacy in the words which she addressed to her just before she breathed her last. "My daughter, believe me, there is but one happiness on earth—to suffer for the love of God." Madame de Bengy died unconscious of the separation which her daughter's vocation was preparing for her; but the blow fell with double force upon the venerable old man, who now turned to her to be the companion and solace of his lonely life. Her father laid all his plans for the future before her, wringing her heart with every word; for, "if I could have formed a wish in life," she says, "it would have been to watch over my father, and to show him every token of affection in my power: my heart was well-nigh broken." Meanwhile she received the news of P. Sellier's proceedings at Amiens, which seemed to have put a stop to the work there, and thus to have left her free to devote herself to the care of

her father. She determined to ask the advice of M. Gaudin, her confessor at Bourges, who, two years ago, had strongly opposed her design, and whose opinion had greatly strengthened the opposition of P. Varin. "I went to him," says Madame d'Houet, "in faith, and begged him to tell me whether he thought I had done wrong in beginning this work, and whether I ought now to give it up and remain with my father. To my great surprise, the Abbé Gaudin replied that this idea was a temptation of the devil; and that, having taken all necessary precautions to ascertain the will of God, before beginning the work, my duty was now to persevere. It was a terrible grief to me to have to make this decision known to my father; it was the greatest sacrifice I have had to make in the course of my life. My poor father could not understand me; sometimes he begged me with tears to remain with him; sometimes he called the whole thing a farce, and told me to make an end of it. I left him with his words rankling in my heart. I was indeed miserable."

With the same simplicity of faith, she no sooner reached Amiens than she referred her difficulties there to the decision of P. Druilhet, whom P. Varin had desired her to consult, and whom she knew to be of one mind with himself and P. Sellier. Her companions remonstrated. "You are putting everything," said they, "into the hands of one who will certainly destroy the work." "I will destroy it without hesitation," said Madame d'Houet, "if he bids me do so. Let us act with simplicity, and in forgetfulness of self. If this work is truly God's work He will know how to maintain it; if not, the sooner it comes to nought the better."

But P. Druilhet encouraged her to proceed, and after three months of conflict she regained possession of her house. "She displayed on this occasion that vigorous energy of character with which God had so singularly endowed her. She was deeply sensible to the pain of having to resist the judgments of men whom she held to be saints, who had hitherto directed, and were still directing, her in the ways of God, and for whom she felt the deepest sentiments of veneration. On the other hand, they were unconsciously supporting her by their very opposition; for they had themselves foretold it, and had even given it as a sign of the approaching success of the undertaking."

Meanwhile, the Bishop of Amiens extended a truly paternal protection to the little community, and the venerable curé of the parish, who fully appreciated their labours for his flock, sent them children, and sought for postulants for them. Yet their numbers did not increase. Their confessor did all in his

power to discourage the novices. No sooner had one entered than he found means to send another away. Mdme. d'Houet was advised to seek another director. "No," replied she, "this trial also is necessary; the good father will only send those away who are not fitted for us; God will keep the others. He has certainly delivered us from some subjects who would have given us a good deal of trouble in the end." She herself dismissed the only one of the sisters who possessed anything like talent, because she was unsuitable in other respects. "We are not bound to find subjects," she used to say; "but we are bound not to keep with us any who will not enter into the spirit of the holy rule which we have embraced." At the end of two years the little community was reduced to its original number of three.

In the month of April, 1822, exactly two years after the opening of the house at Amiens, Mdme. d'Houet was attacked by an illness which the best physicians in Paris pronounced to be mortal. She might, they said, with care and perfect quiet, live another year. The sister on whom she depended for the work of the school was taken dangerously ill at the same time. Mdme. d'Houet overtasked her failing strength in nursing her, and was rewarded by seeing her gradually recover. Her own malady was gaining ground every day. "I seemed," she says, "to have no hope of recovery, and knowing not to whom I was to intrust the work which had been given to me of forming this poor little society, I sent for Julie Guillemet, a child of thirteen, who attended our school, and who at a very early age had shown a desire to join us. I told her in a very few words what I believed to be the will of God. 'You see, my dear child,' I said, 'I am soon to leave this world. Take upon yourself the task which our Lord had imposed upon me; offer yourself to Him with courage and generosity to accomplish His adorable purposes; be a docile instrument in His hands, and He will do His work by you.' She did at once what I required of her, and she promised me to labour henceforth with all her might in the establishment of this work. Thus, after two years of hard labour and most painful crosses, we were reduced to depend upon a child of thirteen, whose poverty almost obliged her to earn her bread by the sweat of her brow."

But man's extremity is God's opportunity. Just as the last ray of hope seemed about to vanish, when the dying woman had left the inheritance of a great thought to a child of thirteen, by the good Providence of God a novice was sent to Mdme. d'Houet, who seemed to bring the blessing of heaven with her; the holy foundress began to regain health and



strength, and soon afterwards, contrary to the expectation of all the physicians, she was perfectly well. The arrival of a number of new subjects soon followed, most of whom proved valuable members to the community. By the middle of October, 1822, the rule was in full vigour, and the noviciate formed.

Our Divine Lord Himself now vouchsafed to take up His abode under the humble roof of His faithful companions, and Mdme. d'Houet chose for herself a cell nearest to the Oratory, the poorest and most inconvenient in the house, in order to be in His blessed neighbourhood.

There she would remain for days in the deepest solitude, almost without nourishment, and so entirely absorbed in God, that her companions dared not approach her. They would then send Julie Guillemet, who would enter noiselessly, with great simplicity and confidence. After patiently waiting and praying for hours unobserved, she would draw nearer to her mother, and earnestly beg her to take some food. Mdme. d'Houet never seemed disturbed by the presence of the child; it seemed as if with her she still felt herself alone. At last she would raise her head, look kindly at her, and gently refuse the offered nourishment; then she would pour forth in the fulness of her heart wonderful words concerning God and the things of God. Julie and all the first mothers of the Society have always believed that at these seasons she enjoyed most intimate communications with God.

The key-note of the harmony of Mdme. d'Houet's own character, and of that which she impressed on her Society, was perfect conformity to the will of God.

"Not only when you are in the chapel," she used to say, "but in the midst of your work, let your heart breathe this short prayer to God :—*My God, give me Thy love. Make me to will what Thou wilt, as Thou wilt it, and when Thou wilt it. Yes, my God, I will all that Thou wilt.*" "Take courage," she would say to her daughters, "and be not disturbed even in the most painful circumstances; are we not most happy in doing the will of God, whatever it may be?" Again—"Perfection consists in willing the will of God as it is, and in willing nothing else. Never, therefore, let us have any other desire for ourselves, or for the Society, but the accomplishment of that holy and adorable will, and never let us put our own in its place."

From this conformity arose her perfect confidence in the good Providence of God.

The Econome of one of her houses had a considerable payment to make at the end of three days, and not a single penny in hand wherewith to meet the demand. She went to her Superioress, and made known her trouble. The Mother listened to her quietly, replied that she had nothing to give her, and began to speak of something else, to the no small annoyance of the poor Econome, who made another trial on the next day, which was received with



equal indifference, and answered by an exhortation to confidence in God. All this was very well, but the money did not come, and the day of reckoning drew near. The religious made another attempt, and this time with visible emotion. The venerable Mother looked kindly at her and said, "Is it not to-morrow that you are to pay this money?" "Yes, mother." "Well, to-morrow is not to-day. Be quiet and pray to God," and she began to speak of something else. The day of payment came. The money was to be paid in the afternoon. The morning was nearly over, when the postman arrived, bringing a large sum of money from the father of one of the pensioners, who thought it might be convenient to the sisters to receive it in advance. It was the very sum required for the present need. The good religious hastened in no small emotion with the money in her hand to her Superioress, who said kindly to her, "You see, my child, that I was right in saying that yesterday was not to-day."

At the end of the year's noviciate the Society numbered twenty members, and at the desire of the Bishop of Amiens and the Archbishop of Bourges, a new foundation was formed at Chateauroux, in the immediate neighbourhood of Mdme. d'Houet's former home. In the following year a house was opened at Nantes, and in 1827 another at Vannes. The works undertaken by the sisters were gradually extended from the daily instruction of the children of the poor, and evening and Sunday schools for adults, to the care of children of the middle and upper classes.

The congregation had now extended beyond the limits of the fostering care of the Bishop of Amiens into three other dioceses. The opposition which had assailed its commencement became more serious and formidable; and, by the advice of the Bishop of Amiens, Mdme. d'Houet prepared to make a journey to Rome, to obtain the approbation of the Sovereign Pontiff. In the year 1809 she had hospitably received into her house at Bourges some Italian ecclesiastics, who had been forced to leave their country by the tyranny of Napoleon. One of these confessors of the faith was the Abbate Mancini, who in 1826 was Archbishop of Sienna, and who repaid her charity by using his powerful influence in her behalf with the cardinals who enjoyed most fully the confidence of Leo XII.

By a special favour, Mdme. d'Houet and her companion were admitted to an audience of his Holiness only a week after their arrival at Rome, and received by him with the most gracious and fatherly kindness. After detailing with the utmost simplicity the origin, object, labours, and trials of the little society, Mdme. d'Houet concluded by saying that it would be the greatest joy of her heart to see it receive the approbation of the Church; nevertheless, that she had come to Rome to learn the will of God regarding it from the lips of

the Vicar of Christ, and that she was ready and willing to see it crumble to dust at his command, or at the expression of his slightest wish.

Leo XII. heard her with the greatest interest. "Far from desiring the destruction of your establishments," he replied, "I would gladly see them extend throughout France." He expressed his satisfaction at the adoption of the rule of the Society of Jesus, so far as it could be adapted to the use of a society of women, and bade the two religious regard the opposition of the Jesuit fathers simply as a trial, doubtless permitted by God for the attainment of some greater good. It was yet too soon, he said, to look for the formal approbation of the Church, but he promised that all the encouragement which they as yet needed should be extended to them, and that the approbation would follow in good time. It would surely come; he promised it in the name of God; but they must wait the fitting time. He repeated this emphatically three several times, adding that he was convinced that the work was the work of God.

The Holy Father asked for a copy of the rule of the new Society, which was laid before the Congregation specially charged with the arrangement of such matters, to be examined when the time for its solemn approbation should arrive. Meanwhile, he addressed a brief to the Bishop of Amiens, recommending the newly-formed Society of the Faithful Companions of Jesus to his care and protection, and to that of the other Bishops of France.

Mdme. d'Houet returned home filled with such joy and confidence as swells the heart of every faithful Catholic at a word of encouragement from the Vicar of Jesus Christ. By the unanimous election of all her sisters, she was now compelled to accept the office of Superioress-general.

In the beginning of the year 1829 she was called to the dying bed of her venerable father. One of the severest trials of her life had been the necessity of crossing his wishes and opposing his judgment, in following her vocation. Before his death, this cloud had passed away, and he took the greatest interest in her work. She writes to Mgr. Mancini, who had known and loved M. de Bengy during his exile at Bourges: "I recommend very earnestly to your prayers and holy sacrifices the soul of my dear father, who has died, like the patriarchs, in the peace and joy of the Lord. His life was one continual prayer. For many years past, he has taken a lively interest in our Society."

The revolution of 1830, which threatened the security of every religious institute in France, suggested to Mdme. d'Houet the expediency of founding a house in some country beyond

the reach of the revolutionary storm. Her own heart turned to England. The Bishop of Amiens advised her first to make an attempt in Belgium. "If you do not succeed there," added he, "visit London on your return, and God will decide."

Mdme. d'Houet chose Julie Guillemet as her companion. As the Bishop gave the young religious his blessing on her departure, he said: "I believe, my child, that your Mother's idea will prevail over mine, and that you will make the foundation in England."

They arrived in a few days at Ghent, where everything promised favourably for their success; but while they were actually in search of a house, the war of independence broke out. It was plainly no time for making foundations in Belgium, and Mdme. d'Houet at once determined to make an attempt in England. P. Bruson, who had done all in his power to promote the foundation at Ghent, tried to dissuade her from what he thought a hopeless adventure. "To found a house in London," he said, "you ought, at least, to have four or five thousand francs, and, even then, it is doubtful if you would succeed." "It matters not," replied Mdme. d'Houet, "I go under obedience; what do I know of the purposes of God?" P. Bruson, having failed to change her design, gave her a letter for a priest of his acquaintance resident at London; and with this single introduction, the two forlorn women were thrown alone and friendless into the great wilderness of London. They wandered about for several hours, unable to discover the residence of the priest to whom P. Bruson's letter was addressed. At last, they made themselves understood by a poor Catholic woman, who showed them the way to the priest's house, at Somers Town. To their great astonishment, instead of being admitted into the abode of a solitary ecclesiastic, they found themselves in the midst of two hundred children, all dressed in the same costume, like the pensioners of a convent school. The venerable priest, who, with his sister, presided over this work of charity, soon appeared to welcome them. The name of F. Nerinx is still in benediction amongst us.

He had received the legacy of this good work from the hands of the saintly Abbé Carron, who had founded it during the laborious and painful days of his exile, thus repaying a hospitality apparently prompted simply by human compassion, by the treasures of Catholic truth and charity.

How many instances do we know, how many more shall we never know till the day when the ways of God shall be revealed, of His gracious requital of the kindness and gene-

rosity which are His own gifts in the natural order, by the free largess of His supernatural graces! Never, perhaps, has this merciful law of His dealing with His creatures been more signally manifested than in the graces poured forth upon England since the prayers and sacrifices of so many confessors of Christ, whom she harboured in their hour of need, have gone up to plead for her before Him. Mdme. d'Houet presented herself with P. Bruson's letter, as a French lady who came to make some inquiries of him; but the good priest immediately guessed that his two visitors were religious: he found them a suitable lodging, and asked them to spend the next day at his house.

Our history now assumes the form of a romance. After breakfast, Mdme. d'Houet opened the subject of her mission in London. She began by stating that she felt bound by the kindness which Mr. Nerinx had shown her to acknowledge that she was a religious. The good priest smiled. "Neither my sister nor I," he said, "doubted from the first moment that we saw you that such was the fact." Mdme. d'Houet then attempted to enter upon the object of her journey. "After dinner," replied Mr. Nerinx, "I shall be at your command. I have no time at present." And yet he found time to talk for two hours on indifferent subjects to the two strangers. When he had left the room, Miss Nerinx showed them with the greatest care over the whole establishment, entering into the most minute details of its arrangements and management. Mdme. d'Houet was amazed, and when she was alone with Mère Julie, she said to her, "Well, what do you think of all this?" "I don't well know," replied she, laughing; "but it seems to me that God has some purpose here."

After dinner, Mdme. d'Houet unfolded her plans. Mr. Nerinx listened attentively, but with a countenance which bespoke little confidence in their success. He then confirmed the assertion of P. Bruson regarding the costliness and difficulty of making a foundation in London by practical details which admitted of no reply.

"In that case," said Mdme. d'Houet, "there is nothing more to be said. I have but one more service to ask of you, which is that you will point out to me the speediest way to return to France." "Not so fast," was the reply; "you have told me your plans, now listen to mine." And he explained to her how these children had been placed in his hands by the Abbé Carron. "My sister and I have devoted ourselves to this work, and only in the course of this year we have greatly enlarged it; but we have often sadly reflected that on our death the work will probably come to nought; we have long," he added, "desired that some religious community should take our place. On your arrival yesterday, my sister and I, and, what is more, every one else in the house, felt at once persuaded that you had been sent by God for this purpose. We have eight persons with us, who all desire to enter religion;

the furniture belongs to us, and we have no debts. I place all this at your disposal, and only ask you to be pleased to accept it. My sister and the young persons who are with her desire to enter your society, and to follow your rule. You will receive them or reject them as you judge best."

Mdme. d'Houet accepted with grateful wonder an offer which came so visibly from God, whose hand was still more manifest in the demeanour of the new postulants.

"These young persons," says she, "good as they were, had been accustomed to have very much their own way." All this disappeared in a moment, the rule was at once well observed, and the spirit of sweetness, humility, and charity which characterizes our Society prevailed here as fully as in any of our other houses. Grace triumphed even over that national feeling which is so strong in England. The French and English sisters vied with each other in humility and love; and the proof that God alone was the bond of this union is supplied by the fact that it has subsisted ever since, and subsists still to the present day.

When Madame d'Houet went in 1826 to ask the blessing of Leo. XII. on her infant congregation, it numbered but four houses, all in France. When she went thither again in 1837 to seek the more formal approbation which he had promised that it should one day receive, it had extended itself into England, Switzerland, and Piedmont.

Her second journey to Rome was undertaken at the urgent desire of the Archbishop of Sienna, who once more exerted his powerful influence in her behalf. The first three months of her sojourn were full of discouragement and humiliation. Her enemies seemed to be all-powerful; her friends dared not declare themselves. She was at last on the point of withdrawing her petition for the approbation of her rule, and preparing to depart from Rome, when by one of those inspirations, under which the sword of S. Peter sometimes cuts the knot which pious and prudent hands have been more and more hopelessly entangling, Gregory XVI. unexpectedly took the matter into his own hands. He sent for Madame d'Houet and her companion, and said to them, after a minute inquiry into the nature and history of their Institute, "I know how much good you are doing; go on, and God will bless you. You bear a blessed name, and you must take the consequences; and, as the companions of Jesus, be prepared to suffer with Him. See, the Church has always been persecuted, and from that persecution has derived her glory and her strength. So will it be with you; take courage, and God will bless you."

Madame d'Houet left Rome ten days after this interview, bearing with her the approval of her Institute by the Sacred

Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. Since that day it has noiselessly and steadily advanced, especially in France, England, and Ireland. A central house was soon established at Paris; and an orphanage for the children left destitute by the cholera was founded in 1849 at Gentilly.

After ten years more of faithful service, the foundress of the Faithful Companions of Jesus went to her reward on the 5th of April, 1858. The last sentence which she uttered, as she gazed fixedly on the crucifix, was this:—"A Companion of Jesus! to die a Companion of Jesus!" Then, after the prayers for the agonizing, she pronounced distinctly the holy name of *Jesus*, and a sudden brightness passed over her face, which smoothed the wrinkles imprinted by a long life of labour and suffering, leaving it peaceful and beautiful in death. It was a look of recognition; and not one of the weeping religious around her bed doubted that this marvellous brightness was "the smile of the soul" at the meeting with its Beloved.

Her body rests amidst her orphans at Gentilly, the place and the work ever nearest to her heart; and Julie Guillemet, her faithful companion, her fellow-worker in England, her first and best-loved child, after three short weeks of separation, was laid peacefully beside her.

Their works live after them; and so large a portion of those works was wrought for England and Ireland, that we believe this imperfect sketch of a holy life and a blessed death will not be unacceptable to those of our readers who may not be acquainted with the narrative of the Abbé Martin.

#### ART. IV.—CATHOLIC INSTINCTS.

*Podoxy Ancient and Modern: its Spirit, Principles, Character, Objects, Prospects, Checks, and Extirpation; with Warnings and Counsels to the People of England.* By JOHN CAMPBELL, D.D., 1865. John Snow, 35, Paternoster Row.

CHILDREN with a turn for natural history find it a pleasant amusement to transfix insects with pins, and preserve them in glass cases. Success in this avocation is in harmonic relation to the size, or the variety, or the unsightliness of the specimen put to the torture. An unusually formidable beetle, or a more than commonly hideous moth, or a remarkably combative earwig, or a strange and poisonous-looking spider, elicits absolute shrieks of delight when dis-



covered, and is pounced upon with an eagerness which perhaps might somewhat savour of cruelty, were it not safely protected by the shadow of Science.

Besides, insects and animalcula in the lower order of nature are not gifted with an over-acute sensibility. Their powers of pain are on a par with their organization. Toads will live for weeks without their brains; tritons, without their heads. A frog, on having parted company with his heart, will hop off, after the excitement of the operation is over, as if nothing very particular had happened. Surely, a reptile which evinces so little concern for his heart or his head, cannot be over-refined in his feelings.

Now there is a very close analogy between the moral and physical worlds. In the order of morals we find insects with organizations every bit as imperfect as can be found in the region of physics. In the field of right and of wrong there are reptiles quite as disgusting as ever were found, either in a semi-torpid condition beneath the bark of dead trees, or playing an active and dissipated rôle in still more unsavoury resorts. The two great nervous centres have as little to do with the existence of insects in the one order, as they have to do with the existence of insects in the other. The toad—"ugly and venomous"—does not disport himself with greater unconcern in his favourite quagmire, after his heart has been dropped into a bottle of spirits of wine, than do certain creatures in the back slums of morality, who appear, indeed, not as if their hearts had been violently severed from their organizations, but rather as if their organizations had never had any place for a heart. Make them but one stipulation and they will be perfectly satisfied. Let them remain in their element and they are contented. Their hearts or their heads are but of insignificant import when it is a question of mud and of garbage.

Such is the train of thought which is suggested to us by the perusal of such a book as "Popery Ancient and Modern."

Dr. Campbell seems happy as long as he is pushing about in the mud and the sewage of a black and an acrid theology; and his happiness appears to sublimate into ecstasy, rising above the base trammels of common sense, decency, and logic, the moment an opportunity offers for soiling with his favourite element the Church of his forefathers. He will dive down any depth, and disport himself amidst the most offensive deposits, if it be only for the pleasure of splashing about in them. And this with the placid conviction that he is not soiling himself, but that he is fouling his neighbour. Then, when he is tired of ecstasy, he can get up a panic. When he has thrown dirt enough, he can fall into syncope at the sight of the mess he



has made. For he has but to fix his eyes on the Catholic Church and croak about her "matchless wickedness," her "abominations," that she is "a gigantic, a tremendous, a bloody reality," "intensely and universally loathed and abhorred;" that "Popery is most licentious, intolerable, and shameful," "sanctioning or encouraging the most villanous crimes;" that "it is a kingdom of abominations and perdition;" that "no phraseology of man can reach the climax of atrocity which distinguishes the Popish system;" and he will appear, in the eyes of pious Presbyterians at least, to have more than good reason for swooning away, crying "desperate," "wicked," "sinful," "hateful," and the like, to the last.

We have, nevertheless, no ill-will against Dr. Campbell. We were ignorant of his existence until his book was lately brought under our notice by himself. And we hope to return (as soon as possible) to the bliss of our previous ignorance, as soon as it has served as a "specimen."

His volume might indeed form the basis of a very curious psychological study. A more swollen exponent of moral obtuseness or intellectual density it has seldom been our fortune to meet. The faculty which generates terror appears to have acted as an absorbent of every other power of his mind. The very mention of the Church seems to galvanize our author into absolute frenzy. Indeed, his mind appears to have been poisoned in its earliest years. He confesses to an instinctive horror of the Catholic system. And having assiduously developed, as a matter of duty, this aboriginal instinct—somewhat to the prejudice of the moral and logical faculty—he is in a position, with a show of sincerity (which would have been impossible in any sensible man), to bring out a volume "quite unique of its kind." It consists, first, of an Introduction, made up of a long quotation from the able essay, "Subjects proper for the Academia," and of statistics of our clergy from the Catholic Directory, thickly interlarded with howls of his own—howls of horror and dismay at the "appalling" and rampant advance of the Church. "The Roman hierarchy in England," he says, "is a machine which may be wrought with a power, the possible, and even the probable effects of which, a century hence, it is appalling to contemplate! With such a Cardinal as Wiseman, there is not a corner in England which may not by that time be reached and drenched by the waters of the Tiber!"\* Then he rushes into figures: "Are our readers aware," he exclaims,

---

\* Introduction, p. xlvii.

"that the Popish lords amount to no fewer than twenty-three? . . . But what of the Popish baronetcies? There are no fewer than fifty-seven of them, making a total, with the peers, of eighty; all true to the Church of Rome, and most ready, at whatever cost, to obey the behest of priests, bishops, and cardinals. Let Churchmen and Protestant Dissenters of every name think on these figures and be instructed!"\* In another place the author says that "he was very early convinced of its (the Church's) matchless wickedness," and "reflects with the profoundest gratitude to the Father of Mercies, on the course which, throughout a long life, he has been led to pursue with regard to Popery." Again, "it is not the least of the mercies of his happy lot that he enjoyed through the press, to an extent rarely accorded to an individual, the means of exposing its errors and denouncing its revelations. Were he to commence his life anew, he would not only not abate his hostility, but augment it tenfold." "When he shall have finished his course, and have been gathered to his fathers, he desires no other monument than a rude slab . . . with the memorable words inscribed below, 'No peace with Rome!'"† Though we are able with difficulty to preserve our gravity at such grotesque ebullitions of conscientious inanity, still it is sad to see such a total waste of power, and such an obstinate resolution to continue to waste it. Dr. Campbell tells us that he has thrown away one life, and if he only had the opportunity he would throw away another.

But we must put aside commentary, however tempting, and give the reader a clearer idea of the nature of his volume. The body of the book is made up of nearly four hundred pages, divided into what the author calls chapters, but what we should be inclined to designate by the more significant title of "paroxysms." Each paroxysm consists of a misrepresentation of some Catholic fact or verity, such as "Justification," "Purgatory," "Celibacy," "the Jesuits," "Papal Supremacy," and the like, invigorated by abusive ejaculations and apostrophes. Thus the Pope, "with the mien of a lamb, has the spirit of a dragon!" Priests "are wolves who only fleece the flock, but do not feed them!"‡ Again, "Brethren the true followers of the Pope must perish with him!" Speaking of Confession, "what tales might be told by the lime-pits, the subterranean passages, and the spirits of murdered infants!"§ The Sacrament of Penance "is a jumble of deception, falsehood, and absurdity."|| The

\* Ibid. xlix. † See Preface. ‡ P. 32. § P. 121. || P. 108.  
VOL. VI.—NO. XI. [*New Series.*] g

Church "adds to the system of lying wonders: one fabrication reposes on another; the mighty structure is reared by adding impiety to impiety, lie to lie, one deception to another deception!"\* The Papal Supremacy is "an impious delusion, a wicked imposture!"† Of Confession in another place, "it is pre-eminently a deed of darkness, having on its forehead the stamp of Lucifer!"‡ After misrepresenting, and grossly maligning, the clergy of the Church, our author concludes:—"Can you refuse to unite in the shout of righteousness, 'No peace with Rome!'—with Rome, the enemy of the human race!"§ "Of all the impostures for which Popery has been infamously celebrated, by far the most monstrous is that of Purgatory."|| We have not been picking out the most offensive quotations.

In fact we have had to step carefully on one side of many of Dr. Campbell's utterances as being far too disgusting to be disturbed. We have been picking our way as well as we can, and have followed him just so far as answers our purpose, and just so far as our own sense of decency will permit. It is only gentlemen who indulge habitually in helpless paroxysms of religious animosity who obtain fool's pardon, though they still continue to disgust. We have invariably observed that the cage of monkeys in the Zoological Gardens has a special attraction for a certain class of mind. The acrobatic performances of those odious animals, so totally devoid of the faintest instinct of decency, are always sure of an audience. Analogous feats of impropriety are, unfortunately, not wanting to Literature. It is this species of gymnastic in which Dr. Campbell seems particularly to excel. And doubtless he is not without his success in catering to the coarse imaginations of the vulgar. There is something specially fascinating to the animal section of the under-educated mind in such performances. But the incongruity of Dr. Campbell's position adds a grotesqueness to his evolutions of which the monkeys are entirely deprived. The reader may not have observed the curious truth, that a man looking like a monkey creates a far more vivid sense of the ridiculous, than does a monkey looking like a man. Almost every monkey looks something like a man; but it is not every man who succeeds in looking like a monkey.

Now, it may seem strange to the reader that, after heading the article "*Catholic Instincts*," we should be treating of instincts the very reverse of Catholic. Surely, it may be said, if ever there was a man deprived of them, that man we believe to be pre-eminently Dr. Campbell; his instincts against

---

\* P. 100.    † P. 65.    ‡ P. 111.    § P. 140.    || P. 131.

the Church are considerably stronger than the instincts of many Catholics in her favour. Whatever we adore, he spurns; what we love, he hates; what we admire, he abhors; what we praise, he condemns; what we believe, he rejects; what we sympathise with, he loathes; what we hold as absolute truth, he declares to be blasphemous falsehood.

And we entirely coincide with the reader. We fully believe that a dog does not bay more piteously at the moon, than does our author sit at the length of his chain and howl all through the long night of his darkness at the calm Church of God. The moth does not flare in the candle and drop damaged to the floor more certainly, than does Dr. Campbell scorch his heart and set his intelligence on fire in the lamp of Catholic faith. As a man looking over the steep of a precipice experiences a drawing of his whole nature down to annihilation, and starts back horrified and dizzy at the power which has been upon him, so do men devoid of Catholic instincts, when they look down from the eminence of human self-sufficiency into the depth of the riches of the knowledge of God as manifested in the Church, draw themselves back with dismay from the fascination which has had hold of them; and, having no other types before their minds than the *à priori* creations of a diseased imagination, they instantly ascribe to Satanic agency that strange and mysterious influence which they are unable to ignore, but for which they can not otherwise account. And we believe that a good specimen of such a man will greatly serve to illustrate our subject. And we moreover believe that Dr. Campbell answers to our wants most providentially. Specimens, doubtless, might be found more reasonable—but then they would be less valid.

The Church has but to touch with the tip of her little finger the exposed nerve in the Old Adam of some men, and it sets them dancing in agony for the rest of their lives. They will have "no peace with Rome." The more absurd, unmeaning, scurrilous, abusive, and forgetful of themselves they are, and of the common feelings of respect for other men who differ from them, so much the more do they serve our purpose.

We propose to speak on Catholic instincts. How the subject is connected with Dr. Campbell will presently appear. These instincts in a general way are the results of the action of the Church upon Humanity. Now, men are affected in different ways by the action of the Church. So is it with the action of Almighty God upon the soul. Some men become reprobates, some become the most perfect saints. Would Judas have been so loathsome a monster to mankind, had he

not been so near the Crucified? Would S. John have been the disciple for whom the heart has special tenderness, had he not been the disciple whom Jesus loved? Would Satan have sunk so low, had he not been so near to God? Would Paul have been raised so high, had he not been crucified with Christ? So with the Church. Some men's natures under her shadow grow with a spontaneous growth into a Catholic life, and even their natural instincts are transfigured to the Lord. Others when the light appear shrink from it, and develop in the reverse direction. They form habits—instincts of the carnal man. The very attitude which they assume, the force of simple opposition to the truth, generates habits, draws forth passions, and forms steady instincts, which increase in vigour and distinctness in proportion to the magnitude of the power which they are directed to oppose.

Now, if we succeed in showing the immense power of the Church over even those without the pale—who merely come under her influence accidentally—*à fortiori* it will readily be conceded that she must possess marvellous power over those who open all their heart to her power, and live in the full radiance of her heavenly light.

We believe that the Catholic Church has displayed her marvellous influence in the case of Dr. Campbell. Had she not existed, he would have been quite another man. He has been repudiating, reviling, calumniating, loathing her, and dancing galvanically at the very mention of her name "ever since he was very young." We have never before this come across such a decided case of the influence of the Church in the development of the lower instincts of man's nature—instincts of fallen Adam, which, like a miasma, have been drawn forth from the darkness of human clay, in poisonous and fetid exhalations, by the bright radiance of the sun of Justice. The strength and exercise of human passion, doubtless, in all its lawlessness and unreason, is here displayed, but the power of the Church is evinced in the very same degree. She has her friends. And they are true, and strong as adamant, they are all her own, nothing can separate them from her—she loves them as the children of her womb, and they love her with all the abandonment of ardent, generous, self-forgetting natures. But she has her foes. And their hatred is implacable. They hate with their whole beings. Indeed, more than this—there appears to be an operation produced in their natures somewhat analogous to the influence of Divine Grace, we mean in its power. For the hatred of some men for the Church of God is something beyond mere human passion. As the saints through Divine

assistance are raised to heroic degrees of love, and are enabled to perform actions which in nature would be above their strength, so the haters of the Church appear to receive an assistance, an energy and bitterness of soul, over and above the efforts of their own base and poisoned nature, and in their action with the Church seem to have a power working within them and tempering all their passions to a far more perfect state of hatred, than could be effected by the most sublimated rankness of mere flesh and blood. It has been so from the beginning. It has been so from the days of Cain. And it is so now. The nearer the hater approaches to the altar, the more intense his hatred is. The nearer he comes to infinite purity, goodness, nobleness, love, the more does his base and craven nature boil and seethe in its presence. Can anything be compared in kind with the hatred of bad men for the holy, save their hatred for the priests of God? It is not a hatred engendered by the reason of intelligence, but it is the bitterness of human passion. Deep instincts are created, old nature is developed, and men form their own eternal and miserable destiny in the full glare of the truth of the Church of God.

It is by all admitted that, as man not only is gifted with powers of reason and intelligence, but moreover with certain tendencies or instincts in his nature, it is oftentimes most difficult to determine when his actions are to be referred to the dictates of his reason, when to the power of that blind force which urges him to act according to mere appetite. Sometimes reason and instinct coincide; sometimes they do not. We certainly in many cases can draw the line, but who can draw the line unerringly and under every circumstance? How often is it not the case that actions which appear essentially the offspring of enlightened intelligence, are shown to be merely the result of some blind necessitated law? We know from every day's experience that actions are performed in nature, and complicated processes completed in the most exquisite and skilful manner, and yet they are the mere dictates of a blind law of necessity, which has no more relation to the processes of intelligence, than have the intricate evolutions of some mechanical contrivance. The wonders of bird-architecture, the polity which rules a hive of bees, the forecasting prudence of the ant, the inconceivable cunning of the wolverine, the sagacity of the faithful hound, the instincts shown in birds of passage—in fact, in all the realms of animated nature—after all, result as little from logical deductions of the mind, as the accuracy of a compass depends upon volition. This we all confidently



assert. We do not for a moment doubt of it. Not that there are no tokens (as it would seem) of intelligence in the animal creation,—for were we merely to judge by signs, who would be bold enough to say that there is no reasoning? but because we start with this knowledge, that, like the growth of plants and trees, these various animal actions are the results of necessitating laws, and are portions—physical portions (if so we may speak) of the development of the creature's life—blind instincts of its nature. Here there is no chance of confusing the operations of instinct with the operations of intelligence; not that some of them do not seem intelligent, but simply because *nemo dat quod non habet*—if there be no intelligence to produce them—they must spring from something else. As long as we firmly hold that no reason is there, no amount of ingenuity, or skill, or craft, or cunning, will puzzle us: it may seem very like reason, but reason it is not.

We all know the Aristotelic definition of a man. That Dr. Campbell has a very abundant share of the *proximum genus* is as clear to us, as that he has been greatly stinted in his *ultima differentia*. That he has enough, however, to prevent him slipping through the scholastic definition down into a lower grade of being, we charitably hope, both for his sake and for our argument. That he has no more than just sufficient, we confidently maintain. If this be true—and who would have the hardihood to gainsay it after reading his book?—he makes the nearest approach possible to those animals whose actions proceed from instinct, without absolutely being one of them. He has within him the least possible amount of that disturbing element (reason), the complete absence of which in brutes renders our judgments on them perfectly secure. In proportion as his nature gravitates to theirs, do we approach the study of him with security. But the more safe we are in the premises drawn from observation upon him, so much the more certain our conclusion; and the more certain our conclusion, the more unanswerable our reasoning. Now, as his nature does gravitate closer upon that of the lower order of creation than that of any other man we know, we can legitimately infer that he is the *safest* possible specimen of the effects of truth acting upon the baser portion of man's nature. The reaction of fallen man against the influence of pure religion, and the instinctive tendency of animal nature to repudiate it, here display themselves in full relief. The spirit of the Church can penetrate, like a two-edged sword, *usque ad divisionem animæ et spiritus*. If she can affect, and that so violently, the animal passions of inferior nature, what, we ask,



will not be her power on the heart which opens itself to the full impression of her influence?

In fine, even did not Dr. Campbell's volume bear on the face of it an unmistakable index of total want of intellectual power, and of a marvellous development of the engines of unreason, we, who know the Church's system is Divine, and therefore true in all its parts, could want no further proof of it than the fact that our author takes up our Catholic verities in systematic order, simply to batter his head against them. It stands to reason that each blow which he administers must increase the obliquity of his intellectual vision, and accounts, at least in part, for the strange things he sees in the Catholic creed. Dr. Campbell's charging at the Church has brought into active play only the negative passions of his nature. Throughout his books he is but ringing the changes on "odium," "fuga," "timor," "desperatio," and "tristitia." Like a wasp on a window, he expends an immense amount of anger and energy without making any advance; he may buzz and scold up the pane, but it is merely to buzz and scold down it again.

But let us now leave our specimen to his happy lot, and take a somewhat broader view of our subject. For Dr. Campbell is not the only man who feels angry against the Catholic Church. His speciality consists, not in his dislike of her, but in the animal way in which he manifests that dislike. He has drank into a coarser nature than often can be found the spirit of the times, and, by his contact with it, given that spirit a darker tinge, and a more venomous poison, than it before possessed. Now this "spirit of the times" is a power as widespread as the Church herself. It is the Church's great antagonist. What we have been witnessing in its most odious form in the concrete—as manifested by Dr. Campbell—let us now look upon in its more general aspect. To understand the antagonistic instincts of our complicated nature, it will be necessary to take into consideration those two huge powers external to ourselves which are ever exerting their influence over us.

The spirit of the times seems, as it were, for instability, the very reflection of the heavens above. Bright, brief, and unsubstantial, it veers and changes, and unfolds itself, and breaks into a thousand forms, or glowing hues, ever new, yet ever old; always attractive, yet impalpable, spreading abroad like some huge power of a higher world, and then condensing into the simplest elements, it astonishes, it bewilders, it fascinates mankind. Do they love beauty? It decks itself out with robes of majesty, and smiles of con-

scious victory, which is a subjugation of itself. Do they love virtue? It can look severe, and utter high moralities from a throne of matchless purity; which, if they call for happiness, will, all at once, by the magic of desire, melt into a couch of luxury surrounded by all the appurtenances of effeminate and voluptuous life. Do men cry for liberty? It assumes another shape, it creates heroes of world-reform, each according to his bent to march across the world, and trumpet forth the pæan of a new regeneration; "progress," "liberty," "reason," "human perfectibility," "science,"—and the note is caught up and echoed by ten hundred thousand throats from ten thousand cities, and re-echoed again, though in a fainter way, amidst provincial towns and in rural districts, till it dies away in uncertain sounds amidst the distant hills. The spirit of the times, however, has a law in its variety. "Motley is the wear"—but motley with a reason in it. The jester must change his quips and cranks, or his master will be rid of him. The spirit of the times is not the spirit of eternity. As the times, so its spirit. The spirit is the shadow, sometimes one length, sometimes another; sometimes one shape, sometimes another; and yet ever the same. The times gives the law to the spirit; or rather, the spirit is but the expression of the times, as it stands in its ever-varying relation to humanity and to religion. There were the first times of all, when giants lived in those days; and they had their spirit—the spirit of the overgrown tropical rankness of the flesh; and they were all drawn under in the flood. There were the times of Israel in Egypt, and Israel through the Red Sea, and Israel singing the song of Moses and of victory; and the spirit of those times was violence and blood. Then there were the times of Christ crucified, and of fiery persecution; and the spirit was of the sword, and of the scaffold, and of torture. Then there were the times of the mighty fathers of the Church, and the child was growing and waxing strong; and they stood around—those venerable men—with the glittering sword of the apologies, like angels at the gates of Eden, to defend the Christ; and the spirit was the spirit of philosophic pāganism, and sharp contest, and spiritual pride. But steadily the truth went abroad, and spread from heart to heart, from the people to the throne, from nation to nation, till the banner of the Cross looked like a triumph. But, after a time, dark clouds gathered themselves together towards the north, and then the living flood of destruction poured down into the plains; and the spirit was that of blind barbarian force; a spirit of wild and boiling blood, trembling after novelty, and pillage, and destruction. It would almost seem

that the giants of old had slipped from their beds where they had sunk at the great flood, and had come over the earth, bringing a more terrific scourge than they had brought before. Yet the "*Spiritus Domini*" won over and conquered even their rugged, uncultured hearts, and upon the ashes of a broken empire planted the emblem of the Crucified. A new and vast civilization grew, as it were, from the foot of the Cross out of the ashes of the past, and reconquered to Christianity more than ever had been lost, planting a clearer faith, a more ardent love, and a mutual charity, which has sealed those days for ever as the ages of faith. But the sunshine was not to last for ever. The spirit of the times may seem to have "slumbered and have slept," but its heart was watching. Pride and sensuality are not destroyed as long as there are men upon the earth. It was not now that the huge flow of a barbarian desolation threatened the happiness of men. There arose a more insidious and more latent foe. It crept into the intelligences of men, smouldering, and scorching, and charring the brightness of their faith, till sensuality set fire to that which had been so fully prepared for bursting into flame, and the result was a conflagration perhaps more desolating and destructive than the fire and the sword of material extirpation. Pride, assisted by sensuality, carried the human reason in triumph, and, amidst the clamour and wild cries of thousands, into the judgment-seat of Moses; and the spirit was a spirit of intellectual rebellion against the spirit of God. How this conflagration spread and raged, and each man set himself up as the arbiter of truth and the supreme judge in religion, need not be told. The history of the last three hundred years need not be recapitulated that it may be seen how the spirit of the present times is but the logical development of the days of Martin Luther—the spirit of mental insubordination to justly constituted authority, both in politics and religion.

But here we must notice that in the midst of these multitudinous variations of the spirit of the times, one spirit remained immovable and unchanged. Founded on a heavenly and eternal principle, upon the truth and the justice of the Unchangeable, she is not swayed by the elements of earthly power, or subject to the vicissitudes of earthly passion. The spirit of the Church, like the Church herself, partakes of the nature of the infallible, and leads, as it were, a charmed life amidst the ebb and the flow of human policies and desires: directing, ruling, and informing her children with the brightness and perfection of unadulterated truth, amidst the multitudinous fascinations and teeming varieties of error. Her

eyes are formed for piercing into the darkness of human depravity, and her hands for drawing forth covert error into the light of day, and her voice for proclaiming to the four quarters of the world, in the face of persecution and the sword, the truths of everlasting religion. This spirit has ever shone from its own strong, steady, and immutable centre, like some giant pharos flooding the storm with light, and making visible the hidden things of darkness. This is the spirit that from the beginning has run parallel with the spirit of the times; or rather the spirit of the times, like a snake on a silver rod, has changed in every hue and every form, crawling and winding, folding and unfolding its poisonous and supple existence around the unbending and unimpressible spirit of the Church. Life, strength, subtlety, activity, energy, accommodation, belong to the spirit of the times. The spirit of the Church is endurance—*non movebor in æternum*. An earnest of it we perceive in the patriarchs, and prophets, and seers of the ancient race; the fulness in Christ crucified. It was this spirit which animated the first apostles, and made their sound to go forth into the whole earth; this spirit it was which carried the martyrs of old smiling to their beds of torment, thinking it a privilege "*pro Christo contumeliam pati*," and lit up the flames of love in their hearts through the application of created fire, becoming whole burnt-offering, devoured with heroic love of the face of Christ. Whatever of grand, of mighty, of noble, of heroic, has gone to God, it has gone to Him filled with this spirit. The aspiration of young hearts after better and purer things, the oblations of self in secret before the eye of God, the strong resolve, the firm courage of the heart, the ready submission of the will, the glow of the soul in the presence of the Bread of Life, the yearning of the spirit towards the glory that is to come, the contempt of all the world holds dearest and cherishes nearest to its heart, the clear, confiding eye of faith stayed on God alone,—all these are but operations of the self-same Spirit who breatheth where He will. This is the spirit which alone can withstand the spirit of the times. It is not only a spirit of endurance, but of stability. The tide may thunder on the shore, or curl its long waves round the bay to topple down amongst themselves in noisy ruin, and then silently slide out in a smooth, expanding liquid plate, till it touch its utmost limits, and then draw itself into the sea again: it may change in hue, in form, in very taste: but the eternal shore on which it sleeps silently, or loudly thunders, is ever one. There will ever be storms, and wrecks be stranded on the beach; the sky will ever vary, and

the winds will ever veer ; but *verbum Domini in æternum manet*, the word of the Lord remaineth for ever ! The spirit of the times is essentially unstable ; the spirit of the Church is of her essence ever one and the same. God is everlasting ; man is frail, changeable, and quickly perisheth away.

Still there is one thing in which instability itself is stable. There is one law of consistency which the spirit of the times obeys, though it obey no other. Through all its changes, whatever its garb, whatever weapon it make use of—it is ever antagonistic to the Church. It may ring all possible chimes and variations of chimes, but it will never for so much as one moment, by the slightest accident or oversight, be in harmony with the Church. It may change its garb with all the wantonness of a conceited coquette, and deck itself out in all the forms and colours which the most imaginative ingenuity can invent, and not one of them but will disgust that spirit which is ever rebuking the vanity of dust and ashes. It may smile or frown, dance or weep, put on sackcloth or deck itself out with diamonds, act the sinner or the devotee—but no avail ; the spirit of the Church pierces through as with a two-edged sword all shallow artifice, and weighs as in a balance the hidden man of the heart.

The most dangerous form, perhaps, which the spirit of the times ever has assumed, was that which manifested itself in the so-called Reformation. It did not then appear so much a spirit of the times, as a kind of new creation. It seemed, as it were, to breathe its own *spiraculum vite* into the human frame. Men often had acted the part of rebellious children, or of weak and wounded creatures—borne away by the tide of human passion, they had been ungrateful, cold, indifferent, servers of the world—but never before this had they forgotten so completely the rock from whence they were hewn, or stood boldly forward and unblushingly—not at all as culprits who had transgressed, but as heroes of a new polity, and the offspring of a fresh creation, having rights to defend and principles of their own to maintain. The Church, her polity, her principles, her children, were repudiated.

The gap between the two powers, as time went on, became more and more glaringly evident ; the spirit of the Church remained what she had always been, while the spirit of the times consolidated itself, and spread itself abroad. As the Roman greatness was born in a nest of thieves, with no polity but the will of the strongest, and the licence dictated by unbridled lust, so also the present spirit of the times, beginning in anarchy and confusion, and amidst the ruins of religion, has become a huge organized power, with

a distinct object, a special polity, with its code of morals, its dogmata of faith, its own philosophy, and its own distinct position. These are nowadays two distinctly hostile camps. The outline of each is definite and unmistakable. Each is a separate and elaborate instrument for carrying out a certain end. The main spring, the works, the whole internal economy of the one, is absolutely independent of that of the other. Damage the one, take its component parts to pieces, scatter them, or confuse them all together, and the other will perform its functions with the same regularity and perfection as before. It is a case of the two standards; for these powers are not only distinct, but they are antagonistic; not only antagonistic, but ever in open and declared antagonism, with a war to the knife, and without any respite in the struggle. Men must choose their side. They cannot shirk, or hide, or creep out of sight, or remain neutral, or slip into the sand. They must stand up boldly, and in the broad glare of day, and under a thousand eyes, take up a distinct position. Many, doubtless, would fain select a middle course, and vegetate and vacillate between God and Mammon. They may half persuade themselves that such is possible; fear, human respect, natural timidity, craven-heartedness, have more power to move some men than dry unfeeling conclusions drawn from premises. Logic points the road, feelings alone give impetus: and where the passions are clamorous and badly broken in, they not only raise a dust, which hides the road of clear intellectual vision, but set up a scarecrow of their own, which men only too gladly follow, delighted to hit on something which may at the same time that it mollifies the cravings of their passions, give their intelligences an object with which to play, serving like the scarlet cloth of a Spanish bull-fight. Such men are not made for, are unworthy of, days of contest. Nobility of soul should of itself draw the war-cry from their hearts, "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth."

In these days nerve, courage, endurance, the love of God, and trust in Him, a generous purpose and an unshaken confidence in the principles of a supernatural life, are necessary to tone the feelings, and to urge the will to the contest against the spirit which is abroad. We are in times of battle, and each one, according to his measure, has to bear the brunt.

And this should be distinctly borne in mind for several reasons. Apathy or indifference in such a contest is simply destruction. In war waged by flesh and blood, mercy can intervene, and life can be spared. But here we must "put on the armour of God," "for our wrestling is not against flesh



and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirit of wickedness in high places." \* To be remiss is to be wounded, to stay the fight is to die. Principles know not the name of mercy. As the rust eats steadily and silently into the hard iron, so principles work their way into the heart, and, if such be their nature, rust and corrupt it. Like some chemical influence, they can, at their touch, change the entire colouring of the human soul, and convert man so completely from his former self as to make his friends almost begin to doubt of his identity. As the air that surrounds us—as some subtle essence which interpenetrates whatever it may meet, too refined to be discovered, too spiritual to be seized,—so the principles which are floating in the world will, of a certainty, insinuate themselves into the soul of him who does not possess within him the only power capable of opposing a subtlety of still greater power to the threatening danger. There is but one influence stronger than the spirit of the times, only one more refined and encompassing—the spirit of the Church of God!

Then, again, the spirit which is abroad in these difficult days not only possesses a subtlety peculiarly its own, but also a refinement and a constraining influence which appears greater now than in a less experienced and a ruder age. The action of three hundred years has reduced the different principles of evil which at first were floating like the corruption of organic matter upon the unstable flow of human thought, to a systematic form. They have been reduced to order, and have been elevated to a system, consistent in its parts, mutually coherent, logically connected, and forming one vast constraining influence, wonderfully complex in its design, and still more marvellously simple in the end to be achieved. So perfect is it in its action, and, by experience of the past, so delicately has it been accommodated to the gauge of each one's intelligence, that it can expand or contract, and set itself to any phase of human imbecility, and occupy the whole seat of the intelligence, often without fear of discovery, till it has weakened the foundation of supernatural belief, rotted into motives founded upon faith, loosened the joints, broken through the keystones, and prepared everything for a sudden dissolution. One breath is only now required, and the noble edifice of supernatural religion crumbles into dust, and the soul left widowed of the only treasure worthy of the name!

---

\* Ephesians vi. 12.



*Nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem frustra vigilat qui custodit Eam ! \**

And, besides this subtlety and refinement, this spirit is in accordance with man's present state of moral degradation—we mean with the weakness and instability of his will, and the abnormal influence of his sensitive appetite. Add to these infirmities his innate love of power, honour, wealth, and fame, and his position, in presence of his subtle, refined, and unrelenting foe, would seem to be almost hopeless. When the fortress is defended by men whose hearts are in reality with the enemy, it is not difficult to prophesy which way the struggle will turn. Never truer than in this case are the words of wisdom, "A man's enemies are those of his own household."

And how many other sympathies are there not in man's complicated and marvellous nature, which chime in with the pervading spirit of the times! First, his tendency unduly to exalt the excellence of his intellectual nature; secondly, his proclivity to esteem ability before holiness and deprecate his moral powers below their germane worth; thirdly, his constitutional carelessness in cultivating his moral sense and spiritual discernment; fourthly, his tendency to usurp into his reason the province subject to religion; fifthly, in consequence, his confusion of what is so singularly distinct, his intellectual and moral nature; sixthly, the bias of the logical faculty to act an aggressive part on the plane of moral accountability, and to substitute a theory of expediency in the place of the intrinsic authority of conscience; seventhly, pride of intellect, which would contract obedience and interior assent within the narrowest limits, and circumscribe authority so as to render it almost impotent, and thus paralyse its powers over the intelligence; eighthly, his continual disposition to place greater trust in Sight than Faith, and to be influenced by arguments drawn from the physical world, and the present condition of human society, rather than by the dictates of an infallible authority to which the reason must tender submission; ninthly, the general gravitation of his nature, "prone to evil from his childhood," towards moral and spiritual prevarication in the different orders of belief and of Christian practice. In a word, there is not one amongst the manifold modifications and phases of the spirit of the times, which does not possess its counterpart, and cannot find its echo, in some human breast. And this necessarily is the case. The spirit of the times is but the expression of human sympathies in their widest sense,

---

\* Psalm cxxvi. 2.

degraded sympathies, but no less truly such. Man's nature is as a harp which can be struck by sinner or by saint. It is one rich fount of capabilities, to be drawn into reality by some external force. The note depends on him who strikes the chord. Not that man is a necessitated being:—far from that. He can place himself in whose hands he will. If he thinks well to place himself in the power of the spirit of the times, well-known fingers will seize the many-chorded instrument, and attune his whole being to the temper of the days in which we live. He can be strong to the heroism of the martyr-saints of God, and can be made to sing a song of love and peace in the midst of torments; or he can be toned to deeds of darkness, or unstrung into frightful discords, till no fingers, however pure, can strike one single tuneful note from his degraded nature. In a word, man's soul can give human expression to two antagonistic spirits, receiving in his being, as it were, the reflexion either of the spirit of the times or of the Church.

Now we have clearly seen the overwhelming and subtle power of that huge organized influence—the spirit of the times,—that it is in harmony with many sympathies and professions of man's fallen nature, that it is so wide-spread, so accommodating, so persuasive, constant, and unrelenting in its labours, that it has been reduced to perfect order and perfection, suiting itself to every phase of the human thought and human action, so that no power of human creation can successfully oppose its subtle influence. What naturally follows from this? Surely that (1) man must consider it his highest and immeasurably most important duty to discover a power Divine which can successfully be brought to bear against so powerful and deadly an antagonist; and (2) how far up to this time he has exerted all his influence to become as fully possessed as possible of that spiritual antidote, the possession of which alone can afford him any hope of security against the enemy; (3) he would carefully, and with extreme interest, study the nature and operations of that all-powerful spirit, as it is in itself and in its relation to himself; (4) he would analyse his own intelligence and moral nature, and anxiously compare his tone and temper of mind, the feelings and the instincts of his being, with the dictates of that spirit with which he felt it of permanent importance to set himself in harmony; (5) he would fear no evil more than the detection in himself of any, the slightest discord between his nature and the higher one with which he felt it imperative to be in tune; and (6), consequently, he would gladly be willing to make any sacrifice of feeling, or throw to the winds his most cherished theories,

rather than set himself out of relation with the only spirit in which he could place entire confidence, and which alone could bear his weakness up against attack.

The spirit, we need hardly say, which, in the presence of the antagonistic power, can become man's *via, veritas, et vita*—is the spirit of the Church. In the very same proportion that he becomes *instinct* with this spirit, in so far will he be protected against corruption, and be built on the lasting foundation of Christ Jesus. We say advisedly "become instinct," for we fully believe that no means can possibly be found so efficient, in these days, for keeping the full bloom and beauty of Christian faith, as the development of the Catholic instincts of man's nature.

That our view may become more precise and intelligible, let us explain somewhat more in detail what we understand by Catholic instincts.

We have before remarked on the instincts of animals, whereby they perform blindly, and by a spontaneous impulse of their being, the various functions proper to their nature. They act through the absolute influence of a necessitating law, and though they often perform the most complicated actions, and bring about results requiring most marvellous dexterity and an inimitable art, still they are as unconscious of their skill, or of the processes through which they unfailingly bring their labour to perfection, as are those modern pieces of mechanism which produce effects hardly less astonishing in their beauty and complexity. The very fact of being ruled, as animals are, by the iron domination of the law of their nature, and being made, blindfold, as it were, to carry to completion those undertakings upon which their subsistence seems mainly to depend, is rather a guarantee than otherwise that such undertakings will be unerringly fulfilled. Did they depend, in place of this, upon the inconstancy of liberty of will, or upon dexterity attained through painful and long protracted practice, the uncertainty of their completion would be incalculably greater. The more fully actions are the result of natural spontaneity, the more perfect and more regular they appear to be.

This animal instinct may be defined as an activity of the sensitive principle which tends to preserve and develop vitality, through its propensity to pleasure and its flight of bodily pain. In orders of nature even lower than the animal, this principle seems to give tokens of its existence. The sensitive plant, the sun-flower, that little scarlet flower that children call the shepherd's weather-glass, and others more than we can mention, appear, as it were, to possess a certain feeling,

and manifest a natural bent for that which fills them with bright life, and a repugnance to whatever is injurious to their nature. Here, again, the law which stands for reason and for will within these plants, works its effect far more completely and more surely than were their actions the result of a balance of arguments, or the consequence of liberty of selection founded upon a series of conflicting motives. Even in these lower orders of creation, there is a simplicity of action which speaks of the perfection of the creative Hand.

Now, though rational creatures are not destitute of instincts which they have in common with brute creation, still it will never be imagined that by them we signify "Catholic instincts." They are rather instincts which Catholicity can easily run counter to, when the supernatural spirit rebukes them and condemns them, and would reduce them to control; they are, moreover, instincts which the human intelligence can be bound over to in slavery, for they quickly blind the eyes of spiritual discernment, captivate the reason, and absorb all the interests and affections of the will, so that a storm of passion and unreason is the inevitable consequence if any one rebuke them, or prove them to be what they are. But of this we have already seen the proof in "Popery, Ancient and Modern." Yet, though animal instincts are by no means identical with those of which we speak, still they serve as a very apt illustration of our point. There is a very striking analogy between the two orders of instincts. An animal elicits an act of approval or of aversion, respectively, as it is affected by an object which creates physical pleasure or physical pain. So the intelligence of a man embraces or rejects spontaneously that intellectual object which is sympathetic or the contrary, as it stands before his consciousness. This may be called spiritual, however, or rational instinct, according to the aspect under which it is considered. It may be defined sufficiently for our purpose—the faculty of tending spontaneously to that "*bonum*" which is proper to the intellect. Neither here nor afterwards are we considering, of course, how far grace is necessary to generate these Catholic instincts, but only what their character is when they have been generated.

But even this faculty can scarcely be called a Catholic instinct. The object on which the intellectual spontaneity exerts itself must be somewhat more restricted. It is confined to *verum et bonum* as presented by the Church. Now this *verum* and *bonum* considered, as they say, objectively, represents a vast body of religious verities, from the primary principles of natural religion to the most subtle and refined conclusions

of the schools. They may be considered as divided into two grand divisions or constellations; that representing faith, and that representing morals—the laws of belief, and the laws of action. Now that faculty of spontaneously tending to these two constellations of truths, as presented by the Church to the intelligence, is what we mean by Catholic instincts; and in proportion as this tendency is strong in the intelligence will it have power, as before we have asserted, to resist the spirit of the times and to stand in all things perfect. Of course we do not exclude those dictates of man's conscience, which, being a divinely enlightened sense of duty, has an intimate connexion with the tendency of which we speak; much less do we either ignore or exclude that temper of Christian faith wrought in us by baptism and by the solicitations of the grace of God: indeed, though these may not proceed from absolutely the same fount as the spontaneity of the intelligence towards Catholic truth, still it cannot well be denied that they give an assistance and an energy to that natural instinct of the intelligence which, rather than extracting from its importance, immeasurably adds to its efficiency. But we do not confine our "Catholic instincts" by any means to the *innate* spontaneity of the intelligence towards that body of truth presented by the teaching of the Church. We include within it that instinctive or spontaneous action of our moral nature which may have been acquired by *habit*. It is commonly said that custom or habit is "a second nature," which means to say, that by dint of the continual repetition of any action, though at first it may have required much labour to initiate, it becomes so far part and parcel of a man's nature as to be at length elicited merely by presence of its proper object, and without any conscious act of reasoning or of the will. It would seem that either the processes of reasoning are superseded, or they are performed with such immense rapidity, that they escape the eye of the intelligence, and to all intents and purposes the acts which are thus elicited can be considered instinctive operations. Were our nature so perfectly harmonious as to be in complete accord with the perfection to which it has been called, we should feel no inclination to forsake that to which we should spontaneously be attracted; and, as the eagle is said to seek the sun, we should grow into a perfect day by a kind of natural attraction to the supreme God of our souls. As we can imagine our proto-parents, before they eat the fruit, living, moving, and having their being, in the God that made them, seeking his face alone, basking in his countenance, and growing towards Him as flowers to the sun,

without impediment of any kind, so we may imagine too what we might have been, by the grace of God, were we not wrenched in nature, weakened in will, and obscured in intelligence. But the shock has gained, and told upon us. There is a side to our nature which can sympathize with a worldly spirit. It is only through effort that we can gain any similarity to the pristine condition of the race. What formerly flowed spontaneously, and without the necessity of any schooling, has to be acquired by persevering toil. Human action on a supernatural plane may become spontaneous, and therefore instinctive in its highest Catholic sense. But for this it must be cultivated. The innate operation of the mind to good is an assistance, but does not do the work. The instincts proper to the supernatural are only engendered by a supernatural habit. And yet how marvellously, after all, is not our nature, even in its fallen state, adapted for the practices of virtue! Independent of those propensions which, as it were, of their nature are assistances to the perfection of man, being such as duty, self-charity, personal love, compassion, gratitude, and many others, we find that those very propensions which are most influential in leading man away from God, "are capable of rendering *most important* assistance towards His love and service;"\* so that, if we only courageously and with a generous abandonment place the many-corded harp of our complicated nature in the hands of the supernatural power of the Church, and are responsive to the magic touches of her fingers, she will be enabled to draw from us a harmony completely in accordance with the spirit which guides her hand. The spiritually educated conscience, the temper of faith bestowed by baptism, the illuminating and invigorating influence of grace, and the innate tendency of the mind to Catholic truth—all these act as handmaids and assistants as we labour trustworthy and lovingly to acquire those higher Catholic instincts, which appear to substitute a certain wondrous spiritual discernment or intuition in the place of laboured conclusions of reasoning, always equivocating and unskilful when they intrude themselves in the province of religion. "So alert," says Dr. Newman, "is the instinctive power of an educated conscience, that by some secret faculty, and without any intelligible reasoning process, it seems to detect moral truth wherever it lies hid, and feels a conviction of its own accuracy which bystanders cannot account for, and

---

\* Ward, on Nature and Grace, p. 278.



this especially in the case of revealed religion, which is one comprehensive moral fact,—according to the saying, ‘I know my sheep and am known of mine.’”

Who is there who has not been struck with wonder at the luminous manifestation of this spiritual intuition in reading the lives of God’s chosen ones! Those painful and weary steps, by which ordinary men press on towards religious truth, seem to have been cancelled in their case. Whilst other men were struggling along the road, they had already arrived at the happy termination, and that naturally, simply, and without any conscious effort, as birds skim through the air while beasts of burthen are slowly toiling, step by step, and by sustained exertion, towards their destination. All things seem simplified for them; the harmony of their hearts appears one with the spirit of God’s truth made manifest. As common men eat, and drink, and labour, as they go naturally to the fields, and at nightfall wearily retire to rest, and thus eke out their span of life day by day—and every day the same, and all this in a kind of half unconscious life from very habit: so, in a measure, the saints appear to have had their “conversation in heaven,” and to have rested on “the face of their Christ,” and to have lived day by day in the light of heaven, and within hearing of its harmonies; and all this in such simplicity, and with so loving an unconstraint, that far from God’s presence being a burthen to them, they would almost begin to loathe their lives where He hid from them for whom alone they cared to live.

It would seem that they were admitted to a familiarity with the Spirit of Christ crucified, and, by reason of this personal love of Him, were entrusted with hidden things of the Spirit—the arcana of the city of God; so that, whilst they were enjoying the possession of their secret treasure, proud philosophers would be vainly searching for it by the light of human reason; as if the deductions of logicians were capable outside the gate of heaven of arriving at the hidden things of wisdom spoken to the Beloved; as if processes and calculations could in any way discover that to which unassisted reason has no clue, and which alone is visible to the penetrating eye of love. This familiarity with Christ, and union of soul with Him, became so much a part of the intellectual life of S. Mary Magdalene of Pazzi, that she became quite stupefied at the thought that it were possible for creatures to feel indifference to the will of God. Through this same unity of sentiment, S. Francis Borgia, S. Teresa, S. Vincent of Paul, S. Gertrude, S. Catherine of Sienna, in a word, all the saints were, in their measure, so far saturated with the Spirit of the Church,

that they could truly exclaim with S. Paul, "And I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me."\*

"Common men," says Dr. Newman, "see God at a distance; in their attempts to be religious they feebly guide themselves as by a distant light, and are obliged to calculate, and search about for, the path. But the long practised Christian, who, through God's mercy, has brought God's presence near to him, the Elect of God, in whom the Blessed Spirit dwells, he does not look out of doors for the traces of God: he is moved by God dwelling in him, and *needs not but act on instinct.*"†

And here we can imagine a certain class of readers losing all patience with us, and if not vocally, at all events mentally, exclaiming, "But come, come, after all said and done, we are not saints! How absurd and extravagant to lay down rules of action for men of the world which belong to an absolutely different class, as if we were all monks and hermits! To expect us, who live, and must live, in the rush and the whirl of the nineteenth century, to go back to the middle ages, and to adopt practices which are all very well for a contemplative order, may, of course, be a very pious delusion; but I certainly don't think it will be a very profitable one. High-flown theories, and unpractical advice in the form of pious ejaculations, possibly might edify a man of the world, but they certainly will not do much towards helping him. If he is to be moved to any thing beyond a smile of pity or contempt, it will not be by imaginative and heated effusions of personal piety, however amiable they may be, but by the sober dictates of shrewd, hard common sense, as applied to the sterling realities of life. A man may aim too high as well as aim too low; and if a standard be thrust upon him which manifestly is beyond his reach, it will produce the very opposite impression to that which it was created to effect. To hold out to a man, for instance, S. Teresa, S. Gertrude, and S. Catherine, as patterns for his imitation, is next door, surely, to laughing in his face! Give us something practical in the place of piety, and let it be something that will stand proof and the wear and tear of the times in which we live."

And this we believe to be the very thing which we are doing. But, first of all, is it not a very strange method of reasoning to say, "I am not a saint, *therefore* I am not called upon to be one"? or, "therefore those maxims and practices by which alone men can arrive at sanctity have nothing to do

---

\* Galatians ii. 20.

† Newman's Parochial Sermons, 5th edition, Sermon VI., p. 86.

with me"? A *thief* might as well exclaim, "I am a rogue; therefore the laws of justice do not apply to me. Give me some practical advice. None of your sublimities and pious ejaculations, if you please. They may suit idle and soft-minded men or imaginative ladies, but they will never do for me. Marvellous simplicity! preaching honesty to the very men whose livelihood depends entirely on picking pockets!" And, then, compassionately, "How little pious persons can enter into the feelings, and appreciate the position, of people in the world!" We believe the rogue's argument to be simply a sophism. If we are not saints, surely we should not *object* to becoming saints. Surely, we should feel ourselves called upon to *tend* to sanctity. Surely, we should at least *wish* to be better Catholics than we are. Christ and the saints are our patterns, and the moulds on which we should be formed. We should aim at tending in their direction. S. Teresa, St. Gertrude, and the rest, are not brought forth as examples for our immediate imitation, but that we may see the *results* of tending in the direction of Catholic instincts—that we may see what those elevated instincts of a Christian spirit can do for fallen flesh and blood. And, as to the cultivation of a Catholic instinct being "impractical" in these days, we most firmly believe that they, and they alone, furnish the specific contradictory to the spirit of the times. We believe that the only safe sheet anchor to keep the vessel to her moorings, is the spirit of the Church, engrafted on the human mind, and pervading and colouring it with a higher sense and a higher wisdom than can be strained out of the faculty of human logic or the elastic rules of modern expediency. Take even those various points in which the spirit of the present world harmonizes with the sympathies of fallen nature. To these, Catholic instinct not only stands in absolute opposition, but it is the only power, it would seem, practically capable of keeping the intelligence in a completely Catholic temper. Reason alone cannot do so—it has tried, and failed. Indeed, reason, now-a-days, wrongly exercised, is the very arch-enemy whom we have to combat—reason, *rapiens et rugiens*, seeking what it may devour. We are, let it be borne in mind, far from despising or holding reason cheap, or from doubting that, so far as it acts on its own true laws, it leads and must lead exclusively to truth. But it is only trained to such action by the educated sense, or feeling, or instinct of the whole man. Its crudeness can be mellowed, its hardness melted down, its bitterness turned to sweet, and its whole nature tempered, toned, and brought to perfect ripeness, like a nectarine on a summer-wall, by the gentle and abiding influence

of the sun of justice, as manifest to this lower world through the Church.

It is not the education of *one* of man's faculties that makes him what he ought to be; nor can one faculty, like reason, keep his whole being, with all its marvellous complications, with its hundred-handed cravings, and its inexhaustible depth of many-coloured sympathies, steady, calm, and sustained in the furnace of man's life in the flesh. And this is not because reason, legitimately exercised, can lead to error: of course not: but because reason itself is influenced, most powerfully acted on, by that vast assemblage of forces which spring up from the human compound. Why, even the very nourishment they take modifies men's views, and consequences have often depended more upon a man's cook than upon his premises. The very air we breathe, the state of the atmosphere, the circumstances of life, our position in society, some passing brightness in present circumstances, the most trivial accident, all can influence, in their measure, the human reason. If the organism of the body be so connected in its parts, that one part suffer if the other part be injured, much more is the double complication of body and soul sympathetic and harmoniously one in feeling and effect. That a man be in health the whole system must be sound. So is it with the moral man. It is as absurd to make logic the panacea for all his moral sicknesses, as to broadly assert that as long as a man can see he cannot possibly get ill. The entire spiritual man, with all his faculties, to the deepest depth of his nature, to the very sources and founts of his moral and intellectual life, must be struck through and mellowed by a power external to himself, and that power alone can be, we again repeat, the spirit of the Church ripening his whole being through the pervading and penetrating influence of a heavenly fire.

That this is undoubtedly the case, not only appears from the sympathetic nature of man, the huge subtle power of the spirit of the times which would wholly occupy him, and the dictates of individual experience, but in truth receives a powerful confirmation from the operation of the spirit acting through the Church. He who "knoweth man's frame, and remembereth that he is dust," hath done none of his works in vain. In all there is a proportion between the power to be used, and the object to be affected. He does not squander away in profusion his power, any more than he throws away the marvels of his wisdom. All is done in number, weight, and measure by the All-seeing and All-wise. Look, then, on the most wonderful work of his merciful-loving hands. See what a

vast, organized, living energy He has placed over the head of man to attune him to a heavenly harmony; witness how the whole system and economy of the Church seeks out, and centres itself on the main-spring of man's moral life—the heart. Instinctively with Christ she exclaims in each of her wondrous instruments for reaching to his inmost nature, "Son, give me thy heart!" The whole history of Christ crucified is one marvellous master-piece, by which love, adoration, gratitude, desire, thanksgiving, sorrow, wonder, praise, are struck from the cords of human feeling, attuning the heart of man to that of his maker. What is baptism but the creation of a new heart; confirmation, but strength of heart; what is penance, but compunction of heart; the eucharist, but the union of heart to heart? "*Dilectus meus mihi et ego Illi.*" what is the spirit of God but the illuminating spirit of divine love, and Jesus himself, but a God-made-man, that with human sorrow, sympathies, and affections, He might more surely and constrainingly take possession of the heart? And why all this?—save that the heart is the centre from whence life is thrown abroad into the whole system till it invigorate with a new vitality the creature of God; save that this is the key-stone to the arch, the strong position which, commanding the whole surrounding country, is a victory and a subjugation of itself; save that thus Christ becomes possessed not only of the great thoroughfares of the feelings, but also of the leading avenues to the reason and intelligence? If you would have the mastery of a man's whole being, you must make a victory of his heart.

Now, what would be the effect of a man (even of inferior parts) fully opening his heart to the sunlight of the spirit of the Church, as manifested in her divine economy, and heavenly ordinances? Would he not naturally become instinct with her spirit, and become coloured by her light? Would not his being be an echo—faint if you will—of the Divine voice, and his heart beat harmoniously with the heart of Christ? Would not the spontaneous action of his intelligence towards Catholic truth, and those instinctive actions acquired by careful practice of a holy life, receive a seal and an illumination from that external power which not only called them forth but is their sanction? Would he not, through this instinctive harmony, naturally detect, rather by sentiment than by sight, whatever were in dissonance with the Church's spirit, and by a refinement of feeling, spontaneously start, as at a false note, when anything suddenly came across him which jarred with his normal Catholic state of mind? Would he not often experience discomfort and unrest in his nature

at certain statements which his intelligence could not detect as false, but which his instinct or educated conscience could not approve as true? Would he not occasionally surprise his friends at the accuracy of his doctrinal statements and his illogical blunders in their defence? Would they not wonder at the strange phenomena that, though his conclusions were almost invariably right, his premises were not very seldom wrong? Would not men who look down on Catholic instincts, or who cultivate what they call their reason to the disparagement of their spiritual discernment, pity or compassionate him as a poor, good fellow, who knew nothing on earth of criticism, and was only fit to say his prayers? And would they not be quite staggered and bewildered when, notwithstanding their vast powers of biblical criticism, their judicial impartiality, and their superior cultivation and knowledge of letters, they found the judgment, passed upon their efforts by the man they so contemptuously despised, endorsed by the formal utterances of a congregation, or by the infallible decisions of the Holy See? Would they not feel as the German generals did who opposed the first Napoleon, that, though he did not appear to know the rules of warfare, still, by an unaccountable instinct, he seemed always to know how to be victorious? Would they not feel it something strange and unfair, something contrary to the order of things, and the general working of cause and effect, that all their talent, learning, reasoning, and acuteness, could not land them there, where, like birds of passage, other men, of far smaller parts and acquirements, dropped down by a kind of natural sympathy or gravitation? Would they not, in a word, testify by their helpless astonishment, or half-contemptuous anger, that after all intellectual cultivation is not the only power a man may possess for acquiring spiritual and moral truth, not the one indication of the preference of God in the affairs of the soul of man; but that there is such a thing as an educated conscience, as a power of spiritual discernment, and a harmony of being with the spirit of the Church, with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, with the holy ones of God, and with all that is elevating and purifying in religion, through which man may see far clearer than with reason the things of the Spirit? It is an error, says Dr. Newman, to make "intellectually-gifted men arbiters of religious questions, in the place of the children of wisdom."\*

To suppose that parts are identical with piety, or that analytical and critical processes can do the work of an exquisitely sensitive and delicately cultivated spiritual ear,

---

\* Sermons before the University of Oxford, p. 56.



is simply to imagine that one faculty can perform the function of another; because a man has acquired a scientific knowledge of the laws of sound, that, therefore, he has an "ear for music." Church history is thickly studded with illustrations of this error. Heresiarchs have not been noted as men of small ability. On the contrary, they have generally been men of considerable power and acuteness. They knew how to criticize, and analyze, and reason; they could use modern methods, live in advance of their age, bring forward proof, put down their finger on chapter and verse, and dive into the mysteries and hidden depths of the biblical criticism of the day; they knew as well as any moderns the correct value of stoical indifference and exceptional impartiality, and would appear to survey religion and morality from a higher and serener platform than could ordinary mortals, who were kept close upon the earth by the heavy and heating materials of gross flesh and blood. They were, what in the eyes of the present world would be considered, men of large minds and calm judgment, unembarrassed by the prejudices of education and unmoved by the petty littlenesses of party spirit,—men eminently qualified for the arduous task of the discovery of truth and the development of science. There was no timid piety or instinctive awe to restrain them from "rushing in where angels feared to tread." Their minds were free from all influences, save those which could be weighed out to them in the scales of logic, or could prove a direct relationship with the laws of thought. And yet, with all their ability and impartiality, they were unable to keep themselves steady in the Church of God. Indeed, they seemed to have cut their way out of her with the very instruments with which they had been entrusted for her protection. They are luminous and living satires on the all-sufficiency of intellectual power in matters of morality and religion.

Can it be denied that in the present day our danger is to hold in too high esteem those qualities of mind which seem almost inseparable from rebellion against authority, and to hold too cheap those other qualities which are invariably to be found in their fulness in God's saints, and in their measure in all His servants? Do we not lay too little stress on heavenly-mindedness, on interior piety, and union with God in prayer and contemplation? Do we not partially forget how fire ignites fire, and that to be united to Christ is to partake of Christ's spirit? Do we not forget that right feelings are unspeakably important helps to the right exercise of reason? Do we not forget that God, and God alone, can absorb the whole complexity and intensity of our affections, and

the deeper we are rooted in Him, the more firmly shall we stand, and draw of His power into the very principle of our lives? Do we not forget that not reason, after all, but love is power; and that many a man has died because he loved, but no man has ever sacrificed his life for a logical conclusion? In a word, do we not think too lightly of those Catholic sympathies and instincts of our nature which are rooted in the love of God, and should spread themselves abroad, like the sap of an invigorating life, through every portion of our beings? These are times in which we should be specially certain of our moorings. We live in slippery days. The world is strong, and encompassing, and constraining. Its breath, the spirit of its life, can be absorbed into the very pores of our moral and spiritual man, and can effect the tone of our minds, and the colouring of our lives, as some withering blast, which, as it passes, dries up and scorches every living thing. Our protection against this spirit must come from one who is not ourselves. It must come from without; it must operate upon us within. It cannot be man; therefore it must be God. God warming, invigorating, illuminating, casting the Brightness of his reflexion into the soul of man, and attuning his intellect, will, and affections into ineffable harmony with the Blessed Three in One.

---

#### ART. V.—CROMWELL'S CONQUEST AND SETTLEMENT OF IRELAND.

*The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland.* By JOHN P. PRENDERGAST, Esq.  
London: Longmans.

AT five o'clock on the evening of the 10th of July, 1649, a great crowd of soldiers and citizens, of Puritan ministers and members of Parliament, was assembled in front of Whitehall, to see the new Lord-Lieutenant, General Cromwell, begin his journey for the seat of war in Ireland; and for many miles out of town, while the sky grew dusk over heath and common, the westward road was scattered with curious country-folk, watching the grand procession pass towards Windsor, under the setting sun. His Excellency went forth, it is related in the *Moderate Intelligencer* of that week, "in that state and equipage as the like hath hardly been seen"—a state and equipage that may have contrasted

in the mind of many a citizen and peasant with that in which the coffin of King Charles had been borne along the same road on a snowy winter's evening barely six months before. The Lord-Lieutenant himself sat in a coach of state, drawn by six stalwart Flanders mares, whitish-grey of colour; and the colour of his liveries was white. Other coaches, carrying his chaplains, his staff, his civil household, and the great officers of his army, followed. His life-guard rode behind and before—"such a guard as could hardly be paralleled in the world." There were eighty of them, "gallant men in stately habit," half bright armour, half buff broadcloth, "many of them colonels, the meanest a commander or esquire—with trumpets sounding almost to the shaking of Charing Cross, had it been now standing." The General was in great consideration these days (wherein he had just entered the fifty-first year of his age), and was rising fast so high that none could see where he would halt. He was evidently taking advantage of the eminent dignity to which he had now been named by Parliament, to assume a degree of ceremonial state and observance hardly in character with the sombre plainness of the period. What may have been his thoughts as he lay down to rest a few hours later, in the most ancient and most royal of all the palaces of England, while through the short summer's night the sentinel's steps again and again measured the distance between his quarters and the vault in which the body of Charles Stuart had lately been laid beside the body of Henry Tudor!

Four days later, the Lord-Lieutenant entered Bristol. There he stayed until the end of the month, amassing troops and resources for his expedition. Thence, taking on his way the garrisons of Tenby and Pembroke, he marched to Milford Haven, whence he sailed for Dublin on the 13th of August—he with 32 ships, Ireton with 40 to follow, Hugh Peters to bring up the rear with 20 more. The expedition consisted of Ireton's, Scroop's, Horton's, Lambert's, and the Lord-Lieutenant's own regiments of horse; of Abbott's, Mercer's, Fulcher's, Garland's, and Boulton's troops of dragoons; and of Ewer's, Cook's, Hewson's, Dean's, and the Lord-Lieutenant's regiments of foot, as well as the Kentish regiment under Colonel Phaire—about 12,000 men in all, with a good park of artillery. It was in the same month and from the same port that Strongbow had sailed five hundred years before, with a thousand men in mail, to attempt the conquest of Ireland; and now once more, not for the last time, Ireland was to be conquered anew—not the Ireland of the mere Irish, Brehons and Bards, far-voyaging priests, the desultory militia of the

clans, the romantic politics of the Pentarchy; but an Ireland for which the descendants of Strongbow's comrades and the marchmen of the Pale, had joined arms with the Celtic chieftains, and what remained of the ancient national organization. All the elements of power within and without the Pale appeared to be combined against the Commonwealth. Lord Inchiquin, the principal personage of the sovereign house of O'Brien, held the office of President of the province of Munster, where, however, more English than the English themselves, he bore a name as much abominated as Strafford's had been or Cromwell's was to be. The peculiarly Celtic province of Connaught was governed, with the same rank, by the chief of the illustrious Norman sept of De Burgo, which, adopting the Irish title of The Mac William, had long borne sway over a greater clan than any Milesian Tanist of the North or Dynast of the South. General Owen O'Neill, a cousin of the last of the great Ulster princes, commanded the army of the Northern Irish—an able and famous officer, some time before distinguished in the Spanish service by his brilliant defence of Arras through the last of its seven sieges, and who for now seven years had led an army in the Irish wars with eminent skill and success. At this critical moment the Commonwealth could not even count on the Ulster Scotch. Under Munro, the native Scotch troops; under the Stewarts and Montgomerys, and Murrays, and Mervyns, grandsons of the Lowland gentry who had led the original Plantation, the regiments of the Laggan were ready, under certain conditions, to make common cause with the rest of Ireland. In fine, the Lord-Lieutenant of the King was the most eminent personage who had yet illustrated the great Norman house of the Butlers of Ormond. He personally commanded the army in front of Dublin; and with him chiefly had the Lord-Lieutenant of the Parliament come from London to cross swords. The same journalist who describes the cavalcade which attended Cromwell from Whitehall to Windsor, winds up his article with this fantastic flourish:—"And now have at you, my Lord of Ormond! You will have men of gallantry to encounter, whom to overcome will be honour sufficient, and to be beaten by them will be no great blemish to your reputation. If you say Cæsar or nothing, they say a Republic or nothing." On the 15th of August, having a favourable wind, so that the voyage only occupied two days, the ship *John*, leading the fleet, cast anchor in Dublin Bay, and Cromwell landed.

The garrison, already elated with the victory which it had won at Rathmines a few days before, received the great Puritan captain with loud thanksgiving, "the great guns

echoing forth their welcome, and the acclamations of the people resounding in every street." But as for the people—the people of Dublin at that time consisted of all who were content to live in a city where it was forbidden, under pain of death, to say Mass, and under pain of banishment to read the Book of Common Prayer. All people of Irish blood had been expressly expelled two years before; and a multitude of English blood, who were, or were suspected to be, Catholics, had lately been drummed out into Ormond's quarters. To the sutlers and scavengers, who probably composed the principal proportion of what remained, the Lord-Lieutenant, on his way from the quay to the Castle, spoke near Dames' Gate, "saying that 'all persons whose hearts' affections were real for the carrying on of this great work against the barbarous and bloodthirsty Irish, and their confederates and adherents, and for propagating of Christ's gospel and establishing of truth and peace, and restoring of this nation of Ireland to its former happiness and tranquillity, should find favour and protection from the Parliament of England and from him.' Which speech was entertained with great applause by the people, who all cried out, 'We will live and die with you.'" Very touching the spectacle to the heart of a newly-arrived Lord-Lieutenant, eager for peace, truth, the propagation of Christ's gospel, and the restoring of the Irish nation to happiness and tranquillity! But to his soldiers, in a little speech that he made to them next day, General Cromwell said that the Irish should be dealt with "as the Canaanites were in Joshua's time." And Joshua, as it is written, conquered all the country of the hills, and of the south and of the plain, and of Asedoth, with their kings; and left not any remains therein, but slew all that breathed, as the Lord the God of Israel had commanded him.

The state of affairs in Ireland when Cromwell assumed the sword of state was sufficiently serious to task all his abilities and resources. Dublin, in which General Michael Jones commanded, and Derry, which was held by Sir Charles Coote, were the only places over which the flag of the Parliament flew. The army which he found in Dublin is described as "composed of dissolute and deboshed men," and had to be completely reformed; but the regiments which he brought with him from England, and those which immediately followed under Ireton's command, were the pick of the Parliamentary army, veterans who had hurled back Prince Rupert's charge at Naseby and Marston, and hustled the Scots at the point of the pike all the bloodstained way from Stonyhurst to Warrington. Against the army of Cromwell, however, there were to be counted three armies, far his superior in numbers if combined,

holding fortified towns or encamped in friendly quarters, and which it was his business to break one after the other—the army of Ormond, the army of O'Neill, and the army of Munro. These three armies were at the moment to be accounted hostile to the Parliament, but there was no actual alliance, or even clear understanding, between them. Each of them indeed had, during the previous eight years of the civil war, crossed swords with the other. Only two years before, Ormond had surrendered Dublin to the Parliament, rather than surrender it to O'Neill. Only a month before, O'Neill had raised the siege of Derry to prevent its falling out of the power of the Parliament into the hands of the Scotch. The army of Ormond represented the simple principle of loyalty to Charles II., coupled, since the recent peace of Kilkenny, with a certain assurance of protection to Catholic interests and liberties. The army of Munro was willing to be loyal to the King, provided the King would swear to the Covenant, which was incompatible with toleration to Popery. The army of O'Neill fought for the freedom of the Catholic religion, the supremacy of the See of Rome, and the national independence of Ireland. Loyalty to Charles II. was not a vital principle with it, hardly even a natural element of policy; it would have preferred a Spanish or a Roman protectorate, or a new sovereign in the person of the Duke of Lorraine or of Owen Roe himself; but if at the end of eight years of fruitless strife, the Commonwealth should insist on making war against the Catholic religion, in a sort of perfunctory combination with the King, then it would perforce sustain the Majesty of the King in virtue of its casual identification with the Holiness of the Pope.

The army designated as Munro's, though his command of it at this moment was by no means complete, was disseminated through the districts occupied by the Scottish Plantation of Ulster. The execution of Charles I. had produced a profound effect both upon the Scotch troops serving in the North, and upon the settlers of Scottish descent, who formed so large a proportion of the population. Notwithstanding Calvinistic bitterness, they remembered that the house of Stuart was a Scotch dynasty. In Enniskillen and elsewhere commanding officers suspected of a weakness towards the Commonwealth were deposed by military mutinies; and the commissions of their successors were solicited from Ormond; but otherwise the royal authority was unfelt or disregarded by the dozen regiments, whose only serious occupation for some time had been a desultory blockade of Derry.

The army of O'Neill consisted of five thousand foot and three hundred horse, excellently officered and disciplined, used



to long marches and open encampments, and who, for now seven years, had been accustomed to see good fortune second the plans of their general. But the career of Owen Roe was drawing nigh to its close. The foreign and domestic policy which he upheld had lately lost its great moral sanction and political authority through the retirement of the Nuncio. The last act of Mgr. Rinuccini had been to lay an interdict on those who agreed to the peace with Ormond. At this moment the bold idea seems to have occurred to O'Neill of negotiating a peace with the Commonwealth instead. The details of this transaction are as yet among the mysteries of history.\* But certain it is that after the execution of the King, O'Neill opened a negotiation with the Parliament through the Spanish ambassador in London, and that terms of toleration were actually proposed, which would have included the Catholics of England as well as of Ireland. To this end Abbé Crelly was sent upon O'Neill's part to London, whither Sir Kenelm Digby also came from Paris, on a pass from Cromwell, to represent the English Catholics. What degree of sincerity there was upon the part of Cromwell and his colleagues in the Council of State towards this negotiation at the beginning, it is hard to say; but the rapid success of Ormond in uniting the military forces of three out of the four Irish provinces against the authority of the Commonwealth, soon left its chiefs no choice; and when they changed their policy, verily it was with a vengeance. Until Cromwell's actual arrival, however, O'Neill had not abandoned the hope of an accommodation with the Parliament, and had such friendly relations with their officers all that year that he was receiving a supply of powder from them the very week that Cromwell left London—which supply Inchiquin intercepted near Dundalk, and carried to Ormond's camp at Finglass. Whereupon O'Neill proceeded to the relief of Coote, besieged by the Scotch in Derry, and raised the siege for him. It was not

---

\* The following account of its scope is from Carte (*Life of James, Duke of Ormond*, v. iii. p. 423, Oxford Edition):—"The design of it was to draw in that party of men (the Irish and the English Roman Catholics) to support the new established scheme of Government in England, upon granting them the benefit of that general toleration which was to be extended to all kinds of sects, and to all communions, except that of the Church of England. Upon this treaty an order was made in Parliament for admitting the Roman Catholics to compound for their estates on easy terms. A new oath of supremacy was drawn up to be taken by Roman Catholics, especially by such as were in orders; for by that gentle appellation the Parliament now began to distinguish them. The supremacy to be acknowledged and sworn was confined wholly to temporal matters, so that it was very suitable to the Independent belief, and did not thwart the Pope's pretensions; and the King's being laid aside, it created little or no difficulty in the affair."

until the month of September, when Cromwell had begun to display, too manifestly to be mistaken, the truculent spirit of his Irish policy, that O'Neill finally agreed to make common cause with Ormond, and, striking his camp on the Foyle, marched rapidly southwards, through the centre of Ulster, towards the seat of war.

Only a year had passed since Ormond sailed from Havre with thirty pistoles in his pocket, to restore the authority of the King in Ireland. No man could have served his master more faithfully or more ably than the Marquess did during these memorable months. Against mutiny in the army—against lack of means to maintain his own dignity and the royal service—against the jealous and generally incapable characters of his chief councillors—against the vast variety of factions, each of which was represented not merely in the assembly but in the camp—finally, against the hostility of the Nuncio, who had laid the terrible penalty of an interdict on Kilkenny and on all the towns which accepted the peace—against such a host of adverse elements and influences, Ormond's extraordinary energy made steady way. He had only Lord Inchiquin to count on when he landed at Cork, and before a month Inchiquin's army was in open mutiny. But Ormond so dealt with them that they appear to have been thenceforward the most serviceable troops at his command. By the close of the year he had conducted his negotiations with the Council of the Confederate Catholics to the end that he desired; and had obtained the control of all their armies, except that of O'Neill. On the 17th of January, while news of the King's fate was expected from day to day, he received the Council in his castle at Kilkenny, and addressed them in a speech, the dignity and gravity of whose language showed how truly he measured the arduous nature of the crisis that was upon them, while its calm tone, once or twice dropping to a melancholy sternness, breathed a courage undismayed by the prospect of the worst event.

And if (he said) we come thus well prepared to a contention so just on our part, God will bless our endeavours with success and victory, or will crown our sufferings with honour and patience; for what honour will it not be, if God have so determined of us, to perish with a long glorious monarchy; and who can want patience to suffer with oppressed princes? . . . (For myself), let it suffice that as I wish to be continued in your good esteem and affection so I shall freely adventure upon any hazard, and esteem no trouble or difficulty too great to encounter, if I may manifest my zeal to this cause, and discharge some part of the obligations that are upon me to serve this kingdom."

So far had Ormond's enterprise succeeded with a lamentable

success, destined as it was to compel the Commonwealth to put forth all its strength to reduce Ireland. During the year that passed between his arrival at Cork and the opening of Cromwell's campaign, the Viceroy had exhibited almost all the great qualities of a statesman—a consummate skill in negotiation, an extraordinary ingenuity in managing men and parties, a strict tenacity to his designs, a steady eye over his agents, a complaisant dignity towards all who came within the sphere of his authority. Seldom has so young a man (he was yet under forty years of age) filled so anxious and thankless an office with so much temper and wisdom, and without a single councillor whom he could thoroughly trust outside the four corners of his own brain. However the wisdom or morality of his policy be contested, it cannot be denied that he bore trial and adversity with a heroic spirit, and encountered the most various and overwhelming difficulties of state with an extraordinary subtlety and energy of mind. The consideration of his natural character, as it showed on the surface, hardly prepares us for the tension it bore and the qualities it exhibited under the pressure of this period. "James the White," as the Irish called him—for his complexion was an exception to the usual swarthy tint of the Butlers—was in his day one of the most shining beaux among the English Cavaliers, and by far the most splendid magnifico among the Irish Toparchs. It was admitted at the court that Lord Ormond made the nearest approach to the fine manners of the Prince of all the gentlemen at Whitehall. He always had ten suits in his wardrobe—silk and satin, plain and quilted cloth—which he wore with a careful regard to the weather, asking his valet each morning before he had his drawers, which way the wind blew. The magnificence, the majesty it may almost be said, of his progresses through Ireland, from Kilcash to Kilkenny, and from Kilkenny to Dublin, quite dimmed, not merely what remained, but what was remembered of the grandeur of the Geraldines. Six coaches, with six horses each, and forty servants on horseback, usually attended him. Five or six other carriages of peers, of knights, and of gentlemen of his own blood, usually swelled his train. He had a master of the horse, a steward of the household, a clerk of the kitchen, a page, and ten gentlemen of good families out of livery in his immediate suite. But he was his own secretary, and he wrote in a style of wonderful precision, weight, and poise—never, indeed, more finely and firmly than in these hard times, when he must often have lamented (while writing eager despatches to lewd loitering Charles, urging him to risk all, and face Cromwell like a man and a King in Ireland) that one year's wages of his servants

in the grand days of Kilcash would now almost feed his army for a month.

But it must be admitted that he wanted one quality without which all the others he possessed were only calculated to act as aggravations of the calamity that was coming. His talents were strictly those of civil life. He had all the capacity of a great governor. He could even govern Ireland. But it was now necessary that he should prove himself to be a great general as well as a great governor. He had to cope with one whose arm was weighty in war, whose plans worked like iron gyves, and who, once he had unsheathed the sword, smote his enemy with a continual stroke. Ormond had a reputation for military talent, which appears to have been generally accepted by his cotemporaries, and is rather triumphantly vaunted by Clarendon. But on what substantial grounds it rested it is now difficult to discover. In this campaign his genius for strategy appears to have exhausted itself in the preliminary toils of bringing his army into the field. When he had got them there, it is too tragically certain that he did not know how to lead them, and was hard-set even to keep them together.\*

Ormond commenced his campaign in May, two months before Cromwell was appointed to Ireland. His chief military adviser in the beginning appears to have been his kinsman, the Earl of Castlehaven, Lord Audley in the peerage of England, eldest son of the Lord Audley of infamous memory, who was beheaded in 1631. Lord Castlehaven was now a tough, jolly, war-and-weatherworn soldier of forty. A sense of natural shame appears to have led him to abandon England in his youth. He served for eight or ten years in the French and Spanish armies, wherever, in Italy or the Low Countries, there was opportunity of seeing a siege, and afterwards, while spending a season on his Irish estates, having been fairly

\* Mr. Carlyle almost denies to the human mind the faculty of comprehending the state of affairs in Ireland when Cromwell arrived. "The history of it," he says (*Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, Part V., note on Letter CII.), "does not form itself into a feature, but remains only as a huge blot—an indiscriminate blackness, which the human memory cannot willingly charge itself with. . . . It is, and shall remain very dark to us. Conceive Ireland wasted—torn to pieces; black controversy as of demons and rabid wolves rushing over the face of it so long; incurable and very dim to us; till here, at last, as in the torrent of Heaven's lightning descending liquid on it, we have clear and terrible view of its affairs for a time!"—clear and terrible view especially, it appears, of "the first king's face poor Ireland ever saw; the first friend's face, little as it recognises him—poor Ireland!" This grotesque gibberish need not discourage the student of a period of Irish history clearest is its own outline, and touching which authorities most abound.

forced to choose his side, he was commissioned a general of cavalry under the Confederation of Kilkenny. He appears to have known the detail of the rough sort of war which was then waging in Ireland admirably well, and to have enjoyed fighting somewhat as he did fox-hunting. Sometimes, indeed, in dudgeon, he changed one field for the other without waiting for furlough. He often evinced a curious ingenuity and audacity in the outlying operations of a campaign. But he had not the head or the taste for *la grande guerre*. He enjoyed the rush and the skill of a skirmish; but in regard to battles, he has laid down a maxim as the result of twenty years' experience, which at this point may with advantage be quoted.

He says, in his eleventh Observation on the Art of War,—

*I do not absolutely reject battles* : for in some cases they are to be sought ; and in others, though a general do not seek fighting, yet he must expose his army to battle, if the enemy will. But certainly it is a matter of great consideration, especially when a country is invaded ; for the loss of a battle is many times the loss of a kingdom : and let a general be never so great a captain, having ranged his army in the best manner, and given to his officers all good orders, yet when the armies are once engaged, he can act little more than one man's part, and is subject by the failure of many others to be overthrown.

Such is the system upon which Ormond appears to have acted in the war that followed. Such a system could hardly have been otherwise than fatal to his affairs. Having a clear superiority of numbers, having continuous reserves and resources to fall back upon, his proper policy would appear to have been to meet the enemy in full force whenever they attempted to burst through the lines of Dublin. Instead, he distributed his best troops in small garrisons occupying fortified towns, at a considerable distance from each other, where they were destroyed in detail, while the force he retained in the field never relieved a siege, or fought an effective engagement.

The difficulties with which he had to contend at the very opening of his campaign were undoubtedly disastrous ; the plain fact is, that he had neither victuals to feed, nor money to pay his army. Early in May, he detailed Castlehaven with 2,000 foot and 300 horse, to occupy Maryborough and Athy. Castlehaven gained both places from the garrisons which O'Neill had left there, in the course of a fortnight, "his forces being all the while in terrible distress, sometimes two or three days without eating, and ready every moment to break, being only kept from doing so by some small sums of money, which the Marquis of Ormond, as fast as he could borrow, sent for their

relief."\* Ormond himself mustered 6,000 foot and 2,000 horse at Carlow, on the 1st of June, but could not stir "till he had borrowed £800 from Sir James Preston, which at that time kept the forces from disbanding. By the help of that sum, and of a little meal taken on credit, he took in Kildare, Talbot's Town and Castle Talbot. But there the money and meal failing, and having borrowed about one hundred pounds from twenty several officers to give the soldiers sustenance, he was forced to stay on the west side of the Liffey, and thereby lost an opportunity of engaging Jones."† The cabals of the camp were at the same time as rampant as if the Treasury was bursting, the fountain of honour overflowing, the enemy reduced to the last extremity. At this moment Preston, Lord Tara, general of the Leinster Confederates, is suspected, not without grounds, of having entered into secret correspondence with the Parliamentary General Jones, and to have even offered to give up Ormond's person, because of his annoyance at Lord Taaffe's appointment to the command of the ordnance. Clancarrige was obliged to resign the rank of lieutenant-general of the army, in order that it might be conferred on Inchiquin; and consequent probably upon this new commission some of Inchiquin's troops refused to obey Castlehaven's orders; whereupon that touchy peer withdrew from the army, and for the next month "diverted (himself) with hunting and other recreations in the country."‡ Inchiquin had brought with him from the south 2,000 men. Lord Taaffe at the same time produced supplies to the amount of £3,000. The whole army at this moment may have numbered 10,000 foot and from two to three thousand cavalry. There was money enough now to provide meal or better provender for a fortnight or three weeks. Ormond again advanced, and on the 19th of June encamped at Castle Knock, within view of Dublin on the north side. Here a council of war determined that before attacking the city, it would be well to reduce the other places occupied by Parliamentary garrisons in the province of Leinster.

Inchiquin was designated for this service. He undertook it with alacrity. "Murrrough of the Burnings" (as the Irish called him) was by no means wanting in military ability. He knew the routine of the art well enough. His character was crafty, rapid, and fierce. Half by the veneration which his name inspired, half by the terror of his discipline, he had established an extraordinary ascendancy over the minds of his soldiers. He had served several campaigns in the Italian wars

---

\* Carte, vol. iii. p. 447.

† Ibid, p. 450.

‡ Castlehaven's Memoirs, p. 113.



during his youth, and his character, in its truculence and its faithlessness, its suspicious instinct, its cold-blooded insight, its grim hard energy, far more resembled a *condottiere* of the Milanese than a chief of the gentlest of the clans of Munster. It was a great character warped, and, so to speak, poisoned by the education of the Court of Wards. His fiery *kerne* now overran North Leinster, like a mountain-stream bursting on a bog. Drogheda (23 miles north of Dublin) surrendered without a shot fired. It was on his way to Dundalk (17 miles further north) that Inchiquin intercepted a convoy of powder passing from the Parliamentary magazine to O'Neill's camp. The fact is exceedingly curious, as a proof of the confidence which existed between the officers of the Commonwealth and the Ulster Irish to so very late a date. A general may pass money to an enemy or a neutral during war, and he need not expect to get any very candid credit for his motives; but there is something that touches a deeper chord in the loan of ball and gunpowder at the turning-point of a campaign. Nor was the officer who commanded at Dundalk a man whom O'Neill could have merely hoodwinked. Dundalk was then the head-quarters of Colonel James Monk, destined ten years thence to restore Charles II. to the throne just violently vacated, and to enter the House of Lords first of the three English military dukes. Monk's troops mutinied when Inchiquin approached the place. He was obliged to surrender the town, which contained considerable stores of arms, ammunition, and clothing; and with it fell the adjoining garrisons of Newry, Carlingford, and Narrow Water. It shows what unstable materials great part of the Parliamentary army, usually considered so well compacted, was composed of, that the principal part of the garrisons of Drogheda and Dundalk at once entered Inchiquin's army. The fact is that up to this time many of the regiments employed by the Commonwealth in Ireland were composed in great part of English or Scotch prisoners taken in the war with the King, and violently impressed for service in the Irish wars, on the assumption that the prejudice of religion and race would prove stronger than any hesitation of loyalty between King and Parliament.

Inchiquin returned to head-quarters, having completely succeeded in all the objects of his expedition. Meantime, a couple of regiments in advance of Cromwell's army had arrived in Dublin, and it was reported that Cromwell himself, with the main body, meditated landing in Munster. Inchiquin at once marched off to look after his province, and Ormond, who had now lain quite still in front of Dublin for five weeks, occasionally parading his army close to the walls, in the hope of pro-

voking an insurrection within, at last determined to attempt the place. He came round to the southern side on the 25th of July, took Rathfarnham on the 27th, and, having advanced to Rathmines, was proceeding to fortify Baginbally, with a view to acquiring the command of the river, when Jones suddenly, at nine o'clock in the morning, sallied out at the head of the garrison, fell on the party working at Baginbally, drove them back at the pike-point on the right wing, cut off this wing, and crushed it so completely that the men, who had hardly had time to get into order of battle, scattered and ran. He then rapidly wheeled on the centre or *bataille*, which was caught at the same time on its other side by a second sally both of horse and foot. Taken between these two fires, and overwhelmed by the sudden, fierce pressure of deadly battle after so long a period of inactivity, the centre, though encouraged by Ormond's own presence and that of his best officers, after a rough pell-mell scuffle of perhaps half an hour's duration, threw down their arms. The left did not even wait for an attack, but, at the sight of the rest running, ran too. Jones's victory was complete. The attack opened at nine o'clock in the morning, and was probably over before eleven. Ormond (out of bed late the night before, writing his despatches) was asleep in his tent when he heard firing in the direction of Baginbally, and before he was well awake, the right was routed. Ere noon, the bridges of the Dodder and the mountain roads towards Wicklow were crowded with panting fugitives. The Royal army had ceased to exist. So many as six hundred of them left their bodies on the fields of Rathmines, now covered with lines of gay suburban villas and gardens. Two thousand were taken prisoners, and of these Carte says three hundred were put to the sword, after promise of quarter. They were probably part of the Drogheda and Dundalk garrisons, who had joined Inchiquin's army during the previous month. Most of Inchiquin's men who were engaged on this occasion, Carte adds, afterwards enlisted under Jones. A soldier of Inchiquin at that time might indeed have fairly compared notes with any Free Lance in the camp of the Constable of Bourbon. It might have happened to him in the course of a few years to have defended Cork against the Catholics for King Charles, sacked Cashel in the name of the Covenant, burned Ballymartin to please the Parliament, and again given up the Covenant and Parliament to rescue Dundalk and Drogheda for the King and the Catholics.

Ormond had not merely lost a battle—he had lost an army. His year's hard work of organization seemed utterly spoiled.

His ordnance, military train and chest, were taken. The flying soldiers spread the panic far and wide. Yet all was not lost—above all his own serene confidence and energetic genius seem to have been hardly disturbed by the disaster. Within a fortnight, he was able to take the field again at the head of a formidable force. Part of his army lying on the north side of the city had not been engaged at all. He had left several regiments in Westmeath, and the King's and Queen's counties, to guard his rear against O'Neill. Inchiquin had a considerable army in Munster. From these three sources he was able at once to compose a force not inferior in numbers and equipment to that which had been beaten at Rathmines. Thousands of the fugitives of that morning, moved by fear, or shame, or hunger, soon came back to their colours. In other directions his military prospects began to clear. O'Neill showed at last an earnest disposition to treat. The Irish general had begun to realize the fact that the Parliament was bent upon a war of extermination. He heard that Monk's recent dealings with him were to be disavowed; and that the general who was coming to take the chief command was prepared to attempt an infinitely worse crime than regicide—the murder of a nation and of a Church. Thus Ormond had good reason to hope that O'Neill and Munro would in the coming campaign march to his aid together. Clanricarde was doing his utmost to get an army collected in Connaught, then decimated and terror-stricken by the plague, the infection of which a Spanish vessel had lately brought into Galway. Many of the southern towns, such as Wexford, Waterford, Cork, and Limerick, had strong trainband garrisons. It is not possible to arrive at the elements of an accurate calculation, but it may be reasonably estimated that there were not less than 100,000 armed men in Ireland, more or less available to resist the Parliament, when Cromwell landed.\*

That Oliver Cromwell came to Ireland with the deliberate intention of extinguishing the Catholic religion, and of exterminating the Irish race, is a fact easily verified. Immediately after his appointment to the office of Lord-Lieutenant, a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to wait upon the London corporation, and ask the loan of £120,000 from the City on account of the war. It appears to have been difficult

---

\* At the close of the war, 45,000 Irish soldiers were allowed to enter the French and Spanish armies; at least 10,000 went abroad before the war actually came to an end; and it is a very moderate computation that estimates at 40,000 more the number killed and transported to the West Indies. There was besides the army of the Ulster Scotch.

to satisfy the City that the money was really wanted for this purpose, or, if so employed, in what sense the war would be carried on. The Lord Chief Baron Wild headed the deputation to Guildhall, which was also attended by Cromwell, and on the part of Parliament addressed the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen. He stated the object of the war very succinctly. "The war in that kingdom," said his lordship, "was not between Protestant and Protestant, or Independent and Presbyterian, but Papist and Protestant; *Papacy or Popery being not to be endured in that kingdom, which totally agreed with that maxim of King James, when first king of the three kingdoms; 'Plant Ireland with Puritans and root out Papists, and then secure it.'*" Cromwell spoke subsequently, but simply to the point of military preparation. He did not in any way qualify the description of the policy of the war which had been given by the Chief Baron; and the City, so stimulated, lent the money. Whether he had ever been sincere in the negotiation with Digby and O'Neill, who shall say? But once Cromwell adopted this fell purpose, it is evident that it only gathered strength until it possessed his soul, and drew succour through all the sources of his fierce fanaticism.\* The allusion to the Canaanites in his speech to the soldiers at Dublin is not

---

\* Mr. Carlyle utterly denies that the Parliament or Cromwell undertook this expedition with any preconceived intention of exterminating the Irish population. "There goes a wild story," he says (Part V. note on Letter CXXXII.). "which owes its first place in history to Clarendon, I think, who is the author of many such: How the Parliament at one time had decided to 'exterminate' all the Irish population; and then, finding this would not quite answer, had contented itself with packing them all into the province of Connaught, there to live upon the moorlands; and so had pacified the sister island. Strange rumours no doubt were afloat in the Council of Kilkenny, in the Conventicle of Clonmacnoise, and other such quarters, and were kept up for very obvious purposes in those days; and my Lord of Clarendon at an after date, seeing Puritanism hung on the gallows and tumbled in heaps in St. Margaret's, thought it safe to write with considerable latitude respecting its procedure. My Lord had the story all his own way for about a hundred and fifty years; and during that time has set afloat through vague heads a great many things. His authority is rapidly sinking, and will now probably sink deeper than it deserves." Mr. Carlyle does not seem to have seen the speech of the Chief Baron, above quoted. It is printed in the *Moderate Intelligencer* (evidently what would now be called a semi-official organ of the policy of Cromwell and the Parliament), of the date 12—18 April, 1649. This speech is surely good evidence of the intentions of the Parliament. It was spoken in the presence of Cromwell, it was spoken in the name of a Parliamentary committee, and it was spoken as an argument to obtain the means indispensable to the conduct of the war. Perhaps Mr. Carlyle would argue that rooting up Papists, and planting Puritans in their stead does not amount to extermination? Lord Clarendon was evidently of another way of thinking, and his authority will hardly sink any deeper on that account.

the only passage that might be cited at this time to show how much the work which Joshua wrought, and the spirit which held him to it, were the matter of his frequent meditation. Words taken from the same :—

Every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, that have I given unto you, as I said unto Moses.

From the wilderness and this Lebanon, even unto the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea, towards the going down of the sun, shall be your coast.

There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life. As I was with Moses, so I will be with thee. I will not fail thee nor forsake thee.

Be strong and of a good courage : for unto this people shalt thou divide for an inheritance the land for which I swore unto their fathers that I would give them.

Was not this then the work of Joshua, again to be wrought in Ireland? Were not the Shannon and the Atlantic to be unto him as the Euphrates and the great sea, where the sun went down of old? Were not the people of the land to be driven out beyond the great river in the west, to "Hell or Connaught," their lands given to the saints, their cities taken, their tribes broken, their nobles bound with links of iron, their kings killed? And if any were to be let remain alive in the land, were they not to be even like unto the Gibeonites "in the service of the people of the Lord, hewing wood and drawing water"? When Drogheda, after having been compassed for six days, fell on the seventh, was it not because, even as at Jericho, the Lord had bid the walls fall down on the seventh day, and delivered the city to Israel? and was it not written that Joshua had "killed all that were in it, man and woman, young and old"? At Hai, too, had he not slain them by the thousand, men, women, and children, all the souls that breathed? And after long war, when the Captain of Israel had "conquered the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the plain" (as indeed the war in Ireland rolled for months to come through the mountains of Wicklow and Wexford towards South Munster, and then back again, through Tipperary, into the great central plains of Leinster), was it not written that "Joshua took all the land, as the Lord spoke to Moses, and delivered it in possession to the children of Israel, according to their divisions and tribes"? And lo! could it be doubted who were the children of Israel in the days of the Ironsides?

The ferocity of a religious general—religious that, is to say, in the sense of the English conventicles—is beyond the barbarity of beasts. It is strange to observe how this peculiar ruthless

character, conscientiously based on the terrible severities of the Old Testament (which ordinary men regard like the fire that burned the cities of the plain—like the Deluge that drowned the earth—as judgments of God acting through the personal inspiration of men in the one case, as He did through the not more merciless elements in the other), reproduces itself age after age, with all the assumption of a distinct religious calling. Wherever an officer of this peculiar type is known to preach to his soldiers, to spend the hours before battle in prayer, to be given to wrestling with the spirit, and to regard himself as executing the word with his sword, what war he makes is sure to surpass the ordinary atrocity of war. In recent days, Stonewall Jackson was a general of this kind; and it is well known that his deliberate conscientious conviction, which he very reluctantly yielded in deference to the authority of General Lee, was that his soldiers should give no quarter in war, but slay every Northern prisoner who fell into their hands. Sir Henry Havelock was a soldier of kindred spirit. When Havelock entered Lucknow, he ordered even the Sepoy soldiers, who were lying ill or wounded in hospital, to be bayoneted in their beds. But the ferocity of Cromwell in war imbued and intoxicated his whole nature, like the instinct of an animal awakened at the taste of blood. This love of carnage is wonderfully expressed in one of his letters, written immediately after the battle of Marston Moor, to his friend Colonel Valentine Walton. Walton's eldest son had been killed by a cannon-ball in the course of the day, and in his account of the young man's death, Cromwell discloses his ideal of what the character of a Christian soldier ought to be:—"He was a gallant young man," he writes, "exceedingly gracious. God give you His comfort. Before his death he was so full of comfort that to Frank Russell and myself he could not express it. 'It was so great above his pain;' this he said to us. Indeed it was admirable. A little after, he said one thing lay upon his spirit. I asked him what that was. He told me it was, *that God had not suffered him to be any more the executioner of His enemies.* At his fall, his horse being killed with the bullet, and, as I am informed, three horses more, I am told he bid them *open to the right and left, that he might see the rogues run.* Truly he was exceedingly beloved in the army of all that knew him. But few knew him; for he was a precious young man fit for God. You have cause to bless the Lord. He is a glorious saint in heaven, whereon you ought exceedingly to rejoice."\*

---

\* Carlyle, Part II., Letter XXI



Such was the spirit of the soldiers whom Cromwell led, and such the rule of the war they made. The measure of the Christian warrior's sanctity was the extent to which he had been the executioner of the enemies of God, and according to this measure mainly was he precious and glorious, fit for God, a saint here and hereafter. Who then were the enemies of God? The Cavaliers of course were His enemies, desperately wicked; but far worse than the Cavaliers were the Irish. A Cavalier was not past conversion or redemption, but the Irish were the natural and predestined enemies of God, His enemies as it were by blood, like the Canaanites and the Amorrites, whom it would be a holy and wholesome act utterly to abolish and destroy. This truculent hatred is nicely distinguished from what was felt for the English and Scotch Royalists by the different usage which obtained in battle towards their women. English and Scotch women do not seem to have been regarded as subject to the sword during the civil war; but a Puritan soldier would bury his pike in the bosom of a helpless Irish woman with no more remorse than he would feel for slaying her husband or her brother in fair combat. Long before Cromwell stormed Drogheda, this seems to have been the settled ethic of his soldiers. The ordinance of 24th October, 1644, "to hang any Irish Papist taken in arms in this country," seems to have been applied without reference to sex. After the battle of Naseby, above a hundred Irish women, the wives, cooks, and sutlers of the Irish troops engaged, fell into the hands of the Parliamentary army, and were murdered in cold blood among their cradles and camp-kettles.\*

---

\* Mr. Carlyle states this fact, but with characteristic unveracity, tries to confuse its meaning away. "There were taken here," he says, "a good few 'ladies of quality in carriages;' and above a hundred Irish ladies not of quality, tattered camp-followers, 'with long skean-knives about a foot in length,' which they well knew how to use; upon whom I fear the ordinance against Papists pressed hard this day." Mr. Carlyle would have his readers to infer that Cromwell's soldiers killed the women for fear they should use their skean-knives! His indecent apology for the ordinance itself may advantageously be quoted in connection with the above passage:—"On the 24th of the same month, 24th October, 1644, the Parliament promulgated its Rhadamanthine ordinance, to 'hang any Irish Papist taken in arms in this country;' a very severe ordinance, but not uncalled for by the nature of the 'marauding apparatus' in question there." Why not tell the reader how inflexible Rhadamanthus repented of his ordinance when he heard that Prince Rupert was hanging Parliamentary prisoners of war, man for man, for every Irish Papist so suspended? It is interesting as an illustration of Mr. Carlyle's remarkable slovenliness (to use no worse a word) in referring to original authorities, that Whitelocke, whom he cites as evidence for the treatment of the prisoners taken at Naseby, and from whom he pretends to quote the passage about "the long skean-knives about a foot in length," says nothing

It is a characteristic of the English nation, that whenever a rebellion arises in any district of the Empire, their first disposition, even before they proceed to vindicate their authority, is to stigmatize the recalcitrant race with the guilt of every conceivable form of inhuman and unnatural atrocity. This phenomenon recurs century after century in their history, with the character of a diabolic agency, always conscious of its power to frenzy even the best instincts of the nation into a savage lust of vengeance. No matter whether the rebellion be in Ireland, or in India, or in Jamaica, the people of England expect to be told that the malcontent race are, while pretending to resist a foreign oppression, in reality the common enemies of the human race. Not merely do the rebels or mutineers kill, burn, and destroy; they violate, they mutilate, they massacre. They slaughter women, with circumstances of cruel barbarity or abominable dishonour. They hack children to pieces, or burn them in bonfires. They bury old men alive. They mangle the bodies of the dead. They mutilate those whom they allow to live, leaving them without eyes, or ears, or hands. The severed feet of little children are reported as having been found lying on the roadside by which their bands have marched. And so, day after day, the public mind is charged with a swarm of loathsome details, until one ferocious cry for blood swells from the whole imperial nation. There are other imperial nations who govern subject races, and who have to endure and to vanquish occasional rebellions to their authority; but, whatever the reason be, they do not seem to feel it necessary to work themselves up to the same wild pitch of wrath by blackening the character of the public enemy. There are frequent risings in Algeria and in the Eastern provinces of Russia; but it is unnecessary, and it would probably be impossible, to persuade the population of Paris or St. Petersburg that the Arab or the Circassian, as well as being a very intractable insurgent, is a monster of every species of bestial vice and worse than bestial cruelty. The government

---

of the sort; and does not even distinctly declare that the women were ill-treated in any way. Clarendon (vol. iv. p. 48, Oxford edition) says, "the enemy left no manner of barbarous cruelty unexercised that day; and in the pursuit killed above one hundred women, whereof some were officers' wives of quality." Whitelocke says that there were one hundred Irish women among the prisoners; he does not say they were killed; but they disappear absolutely from his account, which relates, in subsequent entries, the provision made for the other prisoners. Doubtless Clarendon's account is the correct authority; but the story about the skean-knives, which Mr. Carlyle thinks justified the cold-blooded murder of these hundred women as "Irish Papists taken in arms," appears to be merely a figment of his own imagination.

of the Czar has been compelled to repress far more dangerous rebellions in Poland than any which the English Government has, at least lately, had to cope with in Ireland. But Russia has been content with conquering, and has not condescended to calumniate Poland. After all is over, when a vengeance has been taken, whose atrocious and indiscriminate violence surpasses the worst excesses charged against the insurgents, there is a return to common sense, sometimes very reluctant, sometimes very rapid. It is gradually discovered, as it was, for example, at the time of the Indian mutiny, that not one single case of mutilation can be proved; or there is a sudden reaction, such as is now passing over the public mind, regarding the alleged Negro conspiracy in Jamaica—at the beginning of the month a cry for vengeance on the Blacks, and at the end of the month a cry for the execution of the Governor. It is a hundred years since Edmund Burke examined the evidence for the great Popish Rebellion of 1641, and came to the conclusion that it was in great part a tissue of fables. Dr. Leland, then writing the history of Ireland, quite agreed with him; but when he came to treat of the topic, so strong was still the public sentiment, that he “wrote for the market.” But in the time of Cromwell, every word of it was believed with an eager appetite of credulity by the mass of the English nation. It is difficult now to read with a grave face (so utterly incredible are they) the horrors of which a regular catalogue then circulated from end to end of England, and which even Clarendon was not ashamed to append to his *Historical View of the Affairs of Ireland*. The task of comparing it with the first accounts of the Indian mutiny and Jamaican outbreak, though revolting, would not be without a certain psychological interest. Some of the imaginary atrocities that most inflamed the popular wrath in the seventeenth century would hardly be believed now at the first glance,—the story, for instance, of the “distracted gentleman who was run through with a pike in the county Cavan, he laughing merrily the while;” or of the “Scotchman, Englishman, and Welshman, who were caught in the county Down, and forced to lie upon raw hides until their joints rotted, insomuch that when two of them were afterwards hanged one of their feet fell off by the ankle;” or how “the rebels forced one Simon Leper’s wife to kill her husband, and then caused her son to kill her, and then hanged the son.”\* The report of cruelty to children does not in those days appear to have had

\* So strong was the appetite, and so absurd the credulity of Irish horrors, that the first pamphlet account of the siege of Drogheda published in London contains a wood-cut title-page, representing how an engine invented by Sir

the same horrifying effect upon the popular imagination that it had during the Indian mutiny, and even during the Chinese war; but cruelty to women, and especially to women in the condition of maternity, was evidently far more profoundly felt than in the present time, when wife-beating and even wife-murder is not an uncommon form of vice among the lower orders, and when the regular practice of divorce has considerably relaxed the old sense of the sanctity of marriage, which lasted long after the Reformation. In 1641, the murder of a pregnant woman seems to have been regarded as a specially phenomenal atrocity; and, accordingly, almost every woman whom the Irish rebels were charged with having put to death was described as great with child, and far more often than otherwise with twins.

It is not to be denied that the rising of 1641 was in parts of Ireland a massacre. Whenever a long-oppressed race, garrisoned by a conquering or a colonist population, rises in general insurrection, each knows that it is a war to the knife. If the ruling race can hold its ground until relief arrives, the case of Jamaica will exemplify its vengeance. If, on the other hand, it is overwhelmed, it will probably fall fighting fiercely, neither giving nor taking quarter. And so, doubtless, hundreds of the Irish Protestant gentry and colonists died, holding out until their castles were burned over their heads, and their bawns ran red with blood. But it is remarkable that every account of the Rebellion speaks of the crowds of women and children, who, from the most distant parts of the country, made their way in safety to the garrison towns. The statistics of Irish Protestantism are a curious branch of science, and even yet scorn to conform to the vulgar system of the census. But it may seriously be doubted whether there were so many Protestants in all Ireland in the year 1641 as are by some of the accounts alleged to have been murdered. And it is certain, and a very memorable fact, that during the following years, the proportion of them who appeared in arms, indicates no sensible diminution of their numbers. Even in the province of Ulster, where the first fury of the rising expended itself, and where the English in general seem to have believed that the Protestants of the Plantation had been utterly annihilated, they were able to maintain, one year with another, as many armed men in the field as the Ulster Catholics could recruit for O'Neill's command. Such was still the case in 1649. But the mass of the English nation nevertheless firmly believed

---

Arthur Aston lopped off the legs and arms of the Parliamentary soldiers in a horrible manner, when they attempted to approach the place. It is among the King's Collection of Pamphlets, British Museum.

that there had been a general massacre, and loved to hope that it would as soon, as it was free from civil war at home, exact a condign vengeance for that long catalogue of impossible ignominies. The feeling of the one nation towards the other has never been over-amiable; but it may be doubted whether, since God made men, one nation ever hated another as the English nation hated the Irish then.

Such was the spirit in which the general, the army, and the people of England regarded the Irish war. Cromwell did not lose a day in commencing his campaign. A fortnight after his arrival in Dublin, he was ready to take the field. On a review of his entire force, he found that he had nearly 17,000 effective troops. On the 24th August he issued a proclamation, notifying his assumption of command, and promising protection, until the 1st of January next, to all well-minded persons who should supply the army with provisions at a fair rate, and stay peaceably at home. He spent one whole day in secret prayer. On Friday, the 27th of August, he divided his army, and taking "eight regiments of foot, six of horse, and some troops of dragoons" (about 10,000 men in all), he crossed the Liffey, assembled his expedition to the north of Dublin, and settled his order of march. The design was, in his own words, "to endeavour the regaining of Tredah (Drogheda); or tempting the enemy, upon his hazard of the loss of that place, to fight." He had crossed the Jordan, and Jericho with its walls lay fair before him. The road ran through a pleasant land. His soldiers saw to the left meadows of a gayer green than any their eyes had known, even in England, scattered with rare fields of golden corn, just ripe for the sickle, and (somewhat of a novelty to their view, perhaps) the dark leafy canopy of the frequent potato-plot—while beyond plantations, tinged with the first sere shades of autumn, spread the exuberant pastures of Meath. On the right they saw the sea, as it circled in a ring of spray round the rocks of Howth, flashing like porphyry through their carpet of pink, and green, and purple heath; further on, Malahide's bright little silver basin of a bay, and the long and graceful curves into which the strand sweeps where the coast clears beyond Balbriggan; while to the north, over twenty miles of unquiet pale-green Channel waves, the brown mountains of Mourne rose like a rampart from the sea. Under the old Round Tower at Swords, which had seen the Danish Vikingr, the Norman knight, follow the same war over the same road, the soldiers of Cromwell haply halted and wondered whether it would not be well to waste a barrel of powder in sending this emblem of a doubtless

worse than Canaanitish idolatry to seek its shadow's length on the sword. But the land itself was surely a land pleasant enough to be taken for Promised. They were three days on the road, and only pitched their tents before Drogheda on the 30th.

Ormond had determined upon what a great modern amateur of the military art has called "the tedious and barren war of sieges." He had an excuse, indeed, since the battle of Rathmines, to which much force must be conceded. If his troops had not been able to resist a sally of Jones's deboshed garrison, how could he expect them to confront in the pitched field Cromwell's iron veterans? Still, it would seem according to common sense to conclude, that enclosing his army by instalments of three or four thousand in such fortified towns as Ireland then contained, was the sure way to destroy it utterly, though in detail and with some delay. Allowance must, however, be made for the time in which Ormond lived, and the counsellor who was at his elbow. When Inchiquin returned to the charge of his province, Castlehaven abandoned the chase for the camp, and rejoined the Marquess with a subsidy of £10,000, which he had scraped together—"either by fair or foul means," he says—in the South. He doubtless rendered invaluable service in the work of reconstruction of the army after the defeat at Rathmines, which, with absurd unreason, he always attributed to Inchiquin.

Assuredly, Castlehaven's voice would be in favour of a war of sieges. The art of war has its fashions; and the fashion of that age was the Siege. For these were the days of ravelin and redan, of counterscarp and covered way, when Condé and Turenne bore the *baton*—when the great Vauban was making his first essays in engineering, and Monsieur Millerie was grand master of the artillery. Castlehaven had seen the siege of Turin and the siege of Arras, and the siege of Landrecy. While he was abroad in countries comparatively destitute of foxes, he was constantly taking horse and riding off to see a town invested; so it was only natural to him to consider that the one correct way of waging war was to be either besieger or besieged. It is an interesting incidental proof of the real military genius of O'Neill that, although his great reputation abroad was due to his skilful and stubborn defence of Arras, he never would make war that way in Ireland. He was aware that there were no fortified works in the country worthy of being named in that age of great engineers. So he used to the utmost, instead, the natural fortifications—the mountains, bogs, rivers, and passes of the country—leaving to the English, here and there, the cold glory of stone walls, while for now seven years he had



marched again and again at his ease through the heart of the island, from Lough Foyle to the Lee. It must have amazed Castlehaven, who had seen the siege of Arras from the French camp in 1640, to find the scientific Spanish Commandant, of whom his Eminence the Prince Cardinal thought such great things, sink into a mere Sergeant-Major-General of Bog-trotters. But O'Neill knew to a nicety the war that suited Ireland as well as the war that suited Flanders; and a few months more proved that Ormond and his council did not.

Having information that Drogheda was threatened by Cromwell, the Viceroy appointed to the command of the place a veteran Royalist officer, Sir Arthur Aston. Ormond's head-quarters were at Trim, in the heart of Meath, and the old cavalier led his command towards Drogheda, through a country full of memories dear to every Irish heart. On his right lay the majestic mound of Tara, hallowed by the history of the Milesian kings, and beyond the hill where St. Patrick kindled his Baal-defying fire, and first preached the Faith to Chief and Druid. On his left the placid "nun-faced river" Boyne, winding slowly through the close rich verdure of undulating meadows, and under the sun-sprinkled shadows of ancient groves, rolled, as it were, reluctantly towards the sea. Sir Arthur Aston had seen many a fair scene in many a foreign land, but hardly any of such a rich and placid beauty as this through which he was now riding slowly to his death. It reminded him most, perhaps, of his peaceful boyhood, amid the ancestral oaks of Aston, near the soft, smooth, winding Dee, as it flows away from the walls of Chester to meet the busy Mersey. Since those far-distant days what a warfare his life had been! Not the sort of war that Castlehaven had seen; the chess-board war of French and Spanish camps. The Boyne looked like a little stream when he remembered the Danube and the Dneister, by whose mighty waters he had led old King Sigismund's Polish lancers against the Turks, in the days when he was a young soldado. But the plain was assuredly pleasanter to the eye than the stern steppes of the North over which he had afterwards marched with Gustavus Adolphus against Tilly. He was riding to meet a more ferocious enemy than Cossack, or Croat, or Spahi. Him, too, he knew. Strafford's keen eye had singled Aston out for command on his return from Sweden, and he led the King's cavalry at Edgehill, where the idea first occurred to Cromwell—struck by the chivalrous courage of the Royalist gentlemen—that to cope with men of honour, the Parliament must have men of religion. He lost a leg afterwards at Oxford, and was supposed disabled for life. King Sigismund

had given him a pension of 700 florins. King Charles promised him a pension of £1,000. But, disabled for life, the brave old grey-bearded cavalier was, at all events, able for death. By his side, into Drogheda, rode another noble English gentleman, full of all the gay gallantry of youth, young Sir Edmund Varney, the son of the Royal standard-bearer, to whom Ormond had deputed the command of his own regiment. This regiment, Ormond's own, recruited among his tenantry—the tall peasantry of Tipperary and Ossory—led the van of the little army. The other battalions were commanded by their own colonels, some of them gentlemen of the Pale, some of the old Irish. Colonel Byrne led his regiment (rather his clan) of hardy Wicklow mountaineers. Colonel Wall's, of the same region, followed. The regiment of Lord Westmeath was recruited among the Nugent tenantry, who tilled the fat land that lies between the lakes of farther Meath. Warren's regiment was probably an auxiliary from the army of Munster, and Sir James Dillon's from that of Connaught. There were 200 horse under Sir Thomas Armstrong. They were about 3,500 men in all, who crossed the Boyne that August evening, and, amid the sound of bells and bugles, and cannon, and the cheering voices of men, and the smiling faces of women, and babies crowing on their mothers' shoulders, entered, and closed the gates that for them would open no more. The grey old veteran of a hundred fights, and the little child of a year old—the fair-faced Leinster woman, singing her Irish song as the tall Tipperary grenadiers strode up the hill—the brilliant young English cavalier, and the wild Wicklow chief—the grave alderman at the Tholsel, the circumspect gunner at the Millmount, priest of hoary head, and lady of high degree—all alike doomed to mingle their blood in a stream full enough to flow from the steps of St. Peter's Church even to the river wharves.\*

---

\* Mr. Carlyle says, with a mysterious intimation of very unpleasant consequences to any person who may presume to contradict him upon the point, that the garrison of Drogheda was mainly composed of English troops. "To our Irish friends" (he says, Part II., Letter CII., Note on Irish War) "we ought to say likewise that this garrison of Tredah consisted in good part of Englishmen. Perfectly certain this:—and therefore let 'the bloody hoof of the Saxon' forbear to continue itself on that matter. At its peril! Idle blustering and untruth of every kind lead to the like terrible results in these days as they did in those." Whatever the peril of contradicting Mr. Carlyle quite flatly on this matter may be, it must be confronted. The garrison of Drogheda was not composed in any considerable degree, or, indeed, at all perceptible proportion of English troops; and there is no actual evidence that there were any Englishmen in the town at the time, except Sir Arthur Aston, Sir Edmund Varney, and Sir Thomas Armstrong. A sentence in

On the 3rd of September, Cromwell came before the town. He spent a week in framing his batteries. On the 10th, his batteries began to play. That day, he beat down the steeple of St. Mary's. Next day, he battered the wall on the south side of the town, until, towards evening, he made two practicable breaches. At five o'clock in the evening, he ordered a forlorn hope of seven or eight hundred men to attempt the place by storm. They were beaten back; their colonel shot through the head. Upon which Cromwell, still seeing his way to enter the town at this point, collecting his reserve, entered the breach at their head, and after fierce hand-to-hand fight, ere night-fall found himself master of the wall on that

---

Ludlow's Memoirs is Mr. Carlyle's only authority for being "perfectly certain" on this point. When Ludlow presumes to form an opinion of Cromwell whom he knew rather well, considerably different from Mr. Carlyle's, Ludlow is spoken of as "a common handfast, honest, dull, and, indeed, partly wooden man,—in whom it might be wise to form no theory at all of Cromwell." But when Ludlow, who was not at the siege of Drogheda at all, and did not, in fact, arrive in Ireland for a year and a half afterwards, says that the troops at Drogheda were the "most English" part of Ormond's army, Mr. Carlyle proclaims the fact as "perfectly certain" in his most Rhadamanthine manner. Ludlow's evidence on this point, and on all the military events that happened about this time, is, however, absolutely without value, as any one who may read his narrative, from the date of Ormond's marching on Dublin until he came to hold military command in Ireland himself in January, 1651, may easily satisfy himself. At this particular time and place, he writes such egregious blunders as that Monk was compelled by his garrison to surrender Dundalk to the Scotch, and that it was to Inchiquin and not to O'Neill that he was sending a supply of gunpowder, when it was violently captured—by Inchiquin's own troops! The palpable absurdity of these statements would lead to the suspicion that, apart from the "wooden" quality in his character, Ludlow may have had some subsequent object agreeable to Monk in deliberately misstating the facts. In either case, the impartial reader will hardly be disposed to take his unsupported statement as perfectly certain evidence, for a circumstance in its own nature eminently improbable, and of which he could have had no personal knowledge. On the other hand (1), we have Cromwell's own list of the regiments in Drogheda when it was taken (Postscript to Letter CV. in Mr. Carlyle's collection), and they were all Irish regiments commanded by their own colonels, except in the case of Ormond's regiment, the command of which was deputed to Varney; (2) Ormond's army was composed exclusively of the troops in the service of the Catholic confederates and of Inchiquin's army, both absolutely Irish, except a handful of officers; nor, in fact, had Ormond any way of getting troops from England at the time, or means of inducing them to come; (3) the only English troops who appear to have been even temporarily joined to his army were the mutinous Parliamentary garrisons of Dundalk and Drogheda, who, it may be remembered, joined Inchiquin's division. These were not very many, and such of them as did not march to the South with Inchiquin's army on the rumour of Cromwell's attempting to land in Munster, appear to have been the "several hundreds" who were put to the sword by Jones, notwithstanding quarter given, after the battle of Rathmines.

side, its inner intrenchments, and St. Mary's Church. The principal part of the garrison had retreated into the Millmount, but being hotly followed, Cromwell's whole army, horse and foot, now swarming into the town, the fort was taken—or rather there is reason to believe, surrendered on promise of quarter—but Cromwell says: “being in the heat of action, I forbade them to spare any that were in arms in the town: and, I think, that night they put to the sword about 2,000 men.” Hemmed in this narrow space, surrounded by the ever-swelling numbers of the enemy, as Cromwell's whole army of 10,000 men gradually girt them round with sword and fire, the place was soon filled with one writhing, bleeding, gasping mound of dying men. Sir Arthur Aston fell sword in hand among the first; and a Cromwellian Captain, who was present, says his body was actually “hacked and chopped to pieces.” English cavalier, Irish chief, fought and fell side by side. Many a mother, and wife, and wife that was to be, in Upper and in Lower Ossory, on either bank of the Shannon, and in the shadowy Wicklow valleys, shuddered in her sleep that night with a tender terrible instinct, as soul after soul from that heap of hapless soldiers, through the thick cloud of powder smoke, and the rank steam of blood, soared sudden towards the stars. During the night, such of the garrison as had escaped from the Millmount, and the great mass of the inhabitants of the town, took refuge either in St. Peter's Church, or in the tower of St. Sunday's Gate and that of the West Gate. Cromwell ordered the steeple of the church, which was of wood, to be fired next morning, and thought it an edifying incident to tell Speaker Lenthall, in his next despatch, that one of those therein burned to death, “was heard to say in the midst of the flames: ‘God damn me! God confound me! I burn, I burn!’” Then, the townspeople and soldiers within the church still stoutly resisting, his soldiers scaled its galleries and lofts. In all human history, there is hardly so horrible an incident as that which happened in this attack. A troop of infants was collected through the town, and each Puritan soldier advanced to the assault, holding a little innocent in one hand as a buckler, in the other his sword or pike, on which the morning's sun was baking the evidence of the night's work in a crust of blood. They penetrated the church. The children were tossed over the wall. In aisle, and vault, a long day of hideous massacre followed. There was no mercy for man or woman, or child. One Parliamentary captain attempted to save a young girl of evident rank, whose tears and prayers had moved his heart to pity; but a private soldier, who saw his design, at once ran

his sword through her body.\* It is a tradition of the country that when another of his officers appealed to Cromwell against

---

\* Thomas à Wood, brother of Anthony à Wood, the great Oxonian scholar, was a captain in Ingoldsby's Regiment, serving in Ireland at the time of Cromwell's landing. He was present at the taking of Drogheda, and his brother's narrative of his own life (prefixed to the *Athenæ Oxonienses*) contains the account he gave his family of what he witnessed. This account is referred to by several recent writers, who hardly appear to have read it. It is, perhaps, the most exact and complete piece of evidence extant as to what actually happened at Drogheda, and as it is not very long, may, with advantage, be quoted here. Anthony à Wood writes :

"About a year before that time, viz., in 1650, he returned for a time to Oxon to take up his arrears at Christ Church, and to settle his other affairs ; at which time, being often with his mother and brethren, he would tell them of the most terrible assaulting of and storming of Tredagh, wherein he himself had been engaged. He told them that 3,000 at least, besides some women and children, were, after the assailants had taken part, and afterwards all the town, put to the sword, on the 11th and 12th of September, 1649 ; at which time, Sir Arthur Aston, the governor, had his braine beaten out, and his body, hacked and chopped to pieces. He told them that when they were to make the way up to the lofts and galleries of the church, and up to the tower where the enemy had fled, each of the assailants would take up a child and use it as a buckler of defence, when they ascended the steps, to keep themselves from being shot or brained. After they had killed all in the church, and up the towers, they went into the vaults underneath, where all the flower and choicest of the women and ladies had hid themselves. One of these, a most handsome virgin, arrayed in costly and gorgeous apparel, kneeled down to Thomas Wood, with tears and prayers, to save her life ; and being stricken with a profound pity, he took her under his arm, went with her out of the church, with intention to put her over the works to shift for herself ; but a soldier, perceiving his intentions, he ran his sword "[into her body. The exact words of Wood cannot be reprinted here.] "Whereupon Mr. Wood, seeing her gasping, took away her money, jewels, etc., and flung her down over the works."

This Mr. Carlyle calls "An old soldier's account of the storm *sufficiently emphatic.*" It is to be hoped that Mr. Carlyle did not really read the document which he so describes. Much as he groans and grumbles over the labour that the study of original authorities costs him, the careful student will frequently find, especially in Irish affairs, that it is well to verify his references and quotations. This letter, then, it is perhaps reasonable and charitable to presume that he did not read, nor even Hugh Peters' letter to the Parliament above alluded to ; for in his comment on Cromwell's declaration, in reply to the Clonmacnoise manifesto, he proceeds to argue, from the silence of the bishops on the subject, that there were no massacres of women or civilians at Wexford and Drogheda. He says :—

"What, perhaps, will most strike the careless modern reader in the Clonmacnoise manifesto, with its 'inferences' of general extermination, is 'that show of moderate usage at present,' and the total absence of those 'many inhabitants' butchered at Drogheda lately—total absence of those, and also of the 'two hundred women in the market-place of Wexford'—who in modern times have even grown 'two hundred beautiful women' (all young and in their Sunday clothes for the occasion), and figure still in the Irish imagination in a very horrid manner. They are known to Abbé Mageoghegan, these interesting martyrs ; more or less to Philopater Irenæus, to my Lord Clarendon,

the wanton slaughter of children, he only answered: "Nits will be lice." Was it not written in Joshua, forsooth, that at Jericho, that godly captain had utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old; and was not this Tredah even their seven-days-circled Jericho, whose walls had, as it were, fallen down at the sound of their horns? Let the Canaanite therein then be slain, root and branch, yea, flower and leaf.

And we slew and slew and slew—slew them with unpitying sword:  
Negligently could we do the commanding of the Lord!  
Fled the coward—fought the brave,—wailed the mother—wept the child,  
But not one escaped the glaive—man who frowned, or babe who smiled.

The two towers remained. They contained six or seven score soldiers, and they held out until they were starved into surrendering. "When they submitted, their officers were knocked on the head, every tenth man of the soldiers killed, the rest shipped for the Barbadoes,"\* and sold into slavery. More than a hundred years afterwards an Irish mariner sailing in the Caribbean Seas was surprised to hear the soft guttural vocables of the Gaelic tongue, and the airy cadences of the Irish music from the lips of a race as brown as the turf of the Bog of Allen. One officer only escaped of all the garrison. Cromwell himself passes over in silence the atrocities perpetrated in the taking of the town, and which did not cease for days afterwards. But Hugh Peters, who wrote the first account of their victory to the Parliament, after stating the exact number of the garrison slain, 3,350 men, adds concisely:—"None spared." Ormond, whose language always bore an exact measure to his meaning and whose information here was direct and complete, wrote to the king:—"On this occasion Cromwell exceeded himself and anything I ever heard of in breach of faith and bloody inhumanity. The cruelties exercised in Dro-

---

Jacobite Carte, and other parties, divided by wide spaces and long centuries from them; but not to this occult hierarchy sitting deliberately close at hand, and doing their best in the massacre way."

This, in so far as it means anything, means that women were not murdered at Drogheda and Wexford, because the bishops at Clonmacnoise omit to say so. What, then, becomes of Thomas (or, as Mr. Carlyle familiarly calls him, Tom—a liberty, by the way, which his brother did not permit himself)—à Wood's "sufficiently emphatic" testimony. Mr. Carlyle's peculiar phraseology, having a purely arbitrary signification, affords abundant opportunity for equivocation; but he is generally taken, when he uses such words as "sufficiently emphatic," to mean direct, veracious, straightforward. Perhaps, however, he really never read "Tom"-à Wood's story.

\* Cromwell's Despatch to Speaker Lenthall.



gheda for four days after the town was taken would make as many several pictures of inhumanity as are to be found in the Book of Martyrs, or in the relation of Amboyna." The priests of the town, Cromwell himself writes, "were all knocked on the head promiscuously, but two; the one of which was Father Peter Taafe, brother to the Lord Taafe, whom the soldiers took the next day and made an end of." The other was taken in the Round Tower, and shot with the officers. A manuscript history of the Society of Jesus in Ireland,\* says:—"One of our Society was tied to a stake and hewn to pieces. Six of our Fathers were then there; now there is none." Two brothers Bathe—one a Jesuit, one a Secular Priest—were tied up together, and shot in the market-place. Father Robert Netterville, old and bed-ridden, was dragged out of his cell, kicked and beaten to the breaking of his bones, and left to die in the street. For four days the streets of Drogheda witnessed every form of martyrdom even to the massacre of the Innocents, and every sort of sacrilege and sin except one. They were in this merciful to women, that they merely murdered them. Even still the town bears evidence of that terrible storm of war which raged within its walls two hundred years ago. Old people call one of its streets the *Bloody Street*, and tell the tradition of six generations, how the carnage overflowed its gutters and caked on its flags. The very shop-signs speak of a population brayed together in the mortar of some universal crushing calamity. The noblest names of Normandy and of the England of the Plantagenets and Tudors—the lordly Latimer, the de Guernons and de Verdons, famous in every field of chivalry from the Pale to Palestine, Montagues and Bellevs, and Dowdalls, are to be found interspersed with the best of the Celtic patronymics, O'Neils and O'Donnells, MacCarthys and MacSwineys—with names like Plunkett and Dromgoole, that belonged to the Danes of Dublin—with names which tell of a Huguenot settlement—with the plain Saxon names which came in with Cromwell's first Corporation, and have remained ever since—all alike engaged in the humble, homely trade of an Irish provincial town; and whether their forefathers arrived with the clan Milesius or the clan Oliver, now become, through the gentle ministry of time, "kindly Irish of the Irish" one and all.

Cromwell's campaign was more than half won by its first fearful victory. "It had the effect he proposed," says Carte.

---

† Quoted in Dr. Moran's *Persecutions of the Irish Catholics*.

"It spread abroad the terror of his name; it cut off the best body of the Irish troops, and disheartened the rest to such a degree that it was a greater loss in itself, and much more fatal in its consequences than the route at Rathmines." And so the curse of Cromwell had begun to spread like a pall over Ireland.

But we must defer the narrative of the rest of the war, and of the settlement which followed to a future article. We need not so long delay, however, our grateful acknowledgment of the labour and zeal with which, in the work named at the head of this paper, Mr. Prendergast has investigated the history of the atrocious Act of Parliament by which three of the four provinces of Ireland were confiscated for the benefit of the Puritan adventurers and soldiers. It is the merest justice to say that hardly any more valuable original contribution has been made to the history of that "tragedy of a country" in the present century.

#### ART. VI.—THE PAPAL ALLOCUTION ON FREEMASONRY.

1. *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobinism.* A translation from the French of the Abbé Barruch. London: 1797.
2. *Proofs of a Conspiracy against all the Religions and Governments of Europe, carried on in the Secret Meetings of Freemasons, Illuminates, and Reading Societies.* Collected from good authorities by JOHN ROBISON, A.M. Third edition. London: 1798.
3. *Der Freimaurer-Orden in seiner wahren Bedeutung.* E. E. ECKERT. Dresden: 1852.
4. *Kann ein gläubiger Christ Freimaurer sein?* Antwort an den Herrn Dr. Rudolph Seyder, von WILHELM EMMANUEL, FREIHERRN VON KETTLER, Bischof von Mainz. Fünfte Auflage. Mainz, Franz Kirchheim: 1865.

THE Papal Allocution, delivered on the 25th of September, brings a heavy indictment against the Masonic and other secret societies. It accuses that wicked association, commonly called *Masonic*, of a conspiracy against the Church of God, and of civil society. To the remissness of Catholic sovereigns, in not having rooted out this abandoned and dangerous sect, though admonished by his predecessors to do so, Pius IX. attributes the numerous seditions and revolts in the past and present generations, the great incendiary wars which have desolated Europe, and the bitter evils which have afflicted and still afflict the Church.

The moral guardian of Christendom warns all honest and pious men against the designs concocted in these secret societies, and denounces the clandestine meeting, the secret oath, and the frightful imprecations attached to the violation of the rules by which all the members are secretly bound. Pius IX. renews the constitutions of his predecessors, and condemns afresh the Masonic Society and others of the same nature, differing only as to form, which are growing up every day, and which either openly or secretly plot against the Church or against lawful governments. The Allocution concludes by exhorting all men to be on their guard against these secret sectaries who, under pretence of laudable objects, are actuated by a burning hatred of the Christian religion and of lawful rulers, but whose sole aim and labour is to destroy all laws both human and divine.

Coming from such a source, none can over-rate the gravity of these accusations, made in the face of day, against the Masonic and kindred societies. The stir which the Papal condemnation has created in the Masonic body is an involuntary testimony to the moral power of the Pope. No sooner did the condemnation of their principles and practices reach them than the Freemasons set to work, not so much indeed to prove that the principles of Freemasonry were in harmony with Christian teaching as, by abusing the Pope, to divert attention from the character of the Masonic and secret societies, as described in the late Allocution. The lodge of Lyons has drawn up a letter of remonstrance against the Papal accusations, the Grand Orient of Paris is also on the alert, and M. Vinet is even said to be meditating a defence of the Scotch rite. There is trepidation in the Masonic camp. Even Freemasons in England can find no better escape than abuse, indecent and unseemly, of the Supreme Pontiff. At a banquet of brethren from Herefordshire, Worcestershire, and Gloucestershire Lodges, the Rev. Dr. Bowles, Provincial Grand Master, asserts, after indulging in coarse vituperations, that the Pope, in condemning these abominable and impious associations, is assaulting the freedom of thought and speech, destroying the rights of the human mind, and fastening an iron yoke on the necks of the people. Not content with mere Masonic cant at home, he fraternizes with continental Masons, and quotes a speech delivered the other day in one of the principal lodges of France by Abd-el-Kader. "In the persons here present," said the Arab Infidel, "I thank Freemasonry in every country. I consider Freemasonry as the first institution in the world. In my opinion every man who does not profess Freemasonry

is an incomplete man. I hope that one day all the principles of Freemasonry will prevail throughout the world, and from that day forward all the nations will be at peace." So much for the Arab chief; now for the English Protestant divine. "Now, it seems to me," he says, "that Abdel-Kader, Infidel and Mussulman though he be, is in spirit a much better Christian than the Pope." Is comment or condemnation necessary? Is not the conduct of this Anglican clergyman in itself the most complete condemnation of Freemasonry—that system of organized religious indifference which makes even a clerical mason prefer the liberality of the Infidel to the exclusiveness of Christianity?

But our business now is, not to examine what Masons, Anglican or Mussulman, have to say in praise of religious indifference, but to show how the severe condemnations pronounced by various Popes in the last and present centuries are justified by the character and history of Masonry. We will examine, 1st, the origin and principles of Freemasonry in its present form; 2nd, the part it has played in the world; and, 3rd,\* the reasons why, independently of the express condemnation of authority, Catholics cannot be Freemasons, and why all men who value the principles of social order and of revealed religion ought to repudiate this great conspiracy against the Church of God and Christian society.

We shall not attempt to unravel the Masonic mystery, to discover its secrets (if there be any), to recount its various grades, or its almost innumerable divisions and schisms; far less shall we trouble ourselves to separate the fabulous or the false from the true accounts as to the original destination of Freemasonry. One thing, however, we are warranted in doing; and that is, in repudiating altogether its mythical antiquity. On this subject folios upon folios have been written in almost every language. Masonic literature is either a mass of absurd puerilities or of audacious inventions. Freemasonry possesses no genealogical tree. Its claim to antiquity is at least unproven, nay, it is deprived of all probability by the absurd unveracity of its historians, and by their frantic efforts to trace to the remotest ages the origin of their institute. In a certain sense, nevertheless, we do not deny to Freemasonry an unenviable antiquity. Its fundamental error, speculative Pantheism, is as old as the Gnostic heresy. It also cannot be gainsayed that there existed at

---

\* This third portion of the subject we must defer to a future examination into the essentially unchristian character of Masonic philosophy, as put forward even by moderate Freemasons of the present day, especially in Germany.

various epochs in the middle ages secret associations infected with Gnostic or Manichean errors, which bore a striking resemblance to modern Masonry. But beyond the errors and secrecy common to each, there are no connecting links between the elder and the modern associations. To the religious Order of Knights Templars, modern Masonry bore no resemblance. Freemasonry is in no sense of the word an Order; it is a mere congeries of various sects. Between the political and religious errors, however, of the corrupt portion of the Order, which, after its suppression, reorganized the institute, and those of modern Masonry, there is an undoubted affinity. There is a like hatred in the higher degrees of Masonry against Church and State, as inflamed in so strong a manner the Knights Templars, who vowed to avenge on the Pope and King the execution of James de Molay, the last Grand Master of the Order. But the relationship between the two consists in an affinity of errors and of evil principles only. When Masonry was first imported from England to the Continent, numerous impostors palmed off on the credulous, as genuine Masonry, an immense variety of fictitious degrees and fabulous rules. The fastidious taste of the French was offended at the vulgarity of the English system. They emblazoned the craft with the emblems and titles of chivalry. Then it was the desire sprang up, as is common in this day to those who have just emerged from trade to gentility, to create a pedigree for Masonry. What more tempting to Masonic impostors, and what more easy, than to connect the homely craft, now promoted to be an agent of revolution, with the celebrated Order of Knights Templars? A German Mason, speaking on the alleged antiquity of Masonry, says, that such historical pretensions do much damage, since, by setting up claims which at the first glance are seen to be incapable of proof, or demonstrably false, they expose the Masonic cause to the scorn of the learned, or to the derision of sound common sense.\* Of Freemasonry in its present form, England was the undoubted birth-place and home.† The date of its origin was the close of the seventeenth century, a period when religion in England was suffering under a collapse. The fever of the Reformation period had produced a reaction, and Protestantism had run its course earlier in England than it

---

\* Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift, No. 13. 1841.

† When Masonry was in its early stage on the Continent, we find that continual reference was made by foreign Masons to the English lodges to settle disputes as to the rites, degrees, and rules of Masonry.

had in other countries. English Deism had generated a philosophy which, transplanted to the soil of France, soon developed into Atheism. Hobbes and Collins and Bolingbroke anticipated the Encyclopedists of France.

It was in England that these libertines and free-thinkers first styled themselves philosophers. It was in the England of the eighteenth century that Voltaire first conceived the guilty hope, by blending false philosophy with impiety, to crush out Christianity. "It was in England," says Condorcet, his historian and his panegyrist, "that Voltaire swore to dedicate his life to the accomplishment of that project; and he has kept his word."\*

In a period when all positive religion had grown distasteful to the intellect and heart of the nation, and in a condition of society accustomed to corporate union, and unwilling to live in lawless independence, Freemasonry, founded on the basis of religious indifference and of universal benevolence, was a welcome substitute for doctrinal religion. If before the time of James II., in the early days of Freemasonry in England, loyalty was its object, since that time toleration of all religious errors has been its chief characteristic. As faith, as the necessity of holding certain tenets, of believing certain dogmas, is the principle of Christianity; so the very opposite principle, the indifference to all religious doctrine, the reception of true and false alike into its bosom, is to Freemasonry the condition and cause of its existence. Hence, no matter how benevolent its intentions or acts, if benevolent they be, Freemasonry is utterly incompatible with Christianity. It is not merely because of its secret mysteries, if so they be, which it reserves for the initiated only; it is not simply on account of its ungodly oaths; nor of its claiming the surrender of the will; nor even because apart from the Church it attempts to set up a rule over the minds of men; still less solely for the impious deeds done in its name or under its shelter; nor for the changeless and unrelenting hostility which Freemasonry ever displays against the Divine authority, has one Pope after another condemned this infamous sect. It is condemned first of all and chiefly because its essential principle is Indifferentism; and speculative Indifferentism inevitably leads to Pantheism, in other words, to a denial of the Personalty of God, and to a rejection of the first motives of morality. In the same way it may be said that the practical side of Pantheism is a simple indifference to all forms of religion. This ancient error, as subtle and penetrating as the miasma which arises out of decaying matter, is drawing

---

\* "Life of Voltaire."



new force from the corruption and dissolution of Protestantism. In the seething state of society, such as Europe now presents, there is no time for delay or hesitation in purifying the moral or intellectual atmosphere, in separating the sound from the unsound elements. Nothing is more remarkable than the way in which the Papal allocutions of the last and present Pontificates revert again and again to the errors of Pantheism, or than the zeal and watchfulness with which unsound speculations are at once detected and condemned. The false theories of Lamennais, the errors of Gioberti's philosophy, Rosmini's untenable positions, were not allowed by Rome to pervert for an instant the minds of men unawares; in the like manner the Holy See corrected or condemned the, perhaps unconscious, Pantheistic tendencies of Baader, the graver errors of Günther, and the open Pantheism of Frohschammer.

Rome everywhere stamps out this speculative plague. And because Masonry gives Pantheism a home and a practical office, Pius IX. has renewed the condemnations of the Church against the detestable Masonic sect.

Freemasonry is an anti-Church in the sense that in opposition to the exclusive Church of God it is the Church of organized indifferentism. But beyond this error, common to all its adherents, it has not, as Masons pretend, an organization like the Church, or like a religious order. It is not one body whose members are dispersed all over the world, bound by one law, animated by one spirit, or obeying one head. Such an organization would presuppose an exemplary exercise of the virtues of obedience and self-sacrifice, but such virtues are utterly opposed to the worldly spirit and self-will of the men who ordinarily compose these secret societies. Freemasonry is simply an aggregate of innumerable bodies, of various degrees and grades, split up into factions and schisms, under various rules and different and opposing leaders. To attribute to such an association and to kindred secret societies the power of directing the march of events, of creating revolutions, and of shaping at their will the minds of men, is an extravagance more like a Masonic boast than a rational judgment. That the power of secret societies is a real and wide spread evil, affecting the spiritual and temporal interests of every class, is what we insist upon without on that account ascribing, as some writers of note in the last and present century do, to this secret power a sovereignty over the world. The efficient causes of revolution are to be sought elsewhere—in the religious or political or intellectual corruption of society—in an unexpected conjuncture of circumstances, or in a long antecedent chain of events. To the gradual but sure development of evil prin-

ciples, precipitated perhaps by sudden violence, the philosophic mind will rather refer those great social and religious revolutions which have changed the whole face of things, than to the crafty, passionate, but limited powers of these subterranean societies.

But as secondary agents the masonic and secret societies exercise a terrible power. The minds of men, heated by political passions, and impatient of the restraints of religion, receive in these dark assemblies a method and a direction which impart to mere popular discontents the character of a conspiracy against the State or the Church. They shape events as they arise to their profit, or accelerate the action of existing causes, or even prepare the way so as to make the worst atrocities of revolution possible. Wherever society, political or religious, is in a disturbed state, there Freemasonry plays its grand part. It labours under absolute kings, like Frederick the Great and Joseph II., to degrade the Church, and to fetter its freedom. In revolutionary states—like Italy, and Portugal, and Spain—it inflames the people against Church, and Crown, and civil society; and in so-called constitutional kingdoms, as in Belgium, Baden, or Saxony, by its secret organization it often at elections turns the scale in favour of liberalism and infidelity, or, worse still, intrudes itself into the magistracy and outrages justice by its presence on the bench.

In Bavaria, under its worst form and in its most flourishing period, during the last century, Masonry even thrust its members into holy orders, and obtained for them ecclesiastical dignities and power the better to undermine its great and consistent enemy—the Catholic Church. That it succeeds in so many ways in accomplishing such evils is an evidence of its power, which it would be folly to overlook. To ridicule or underrate the dangerous influence of Masonic and kindred associations is more puerile and far more disastrous than to create a panic by an overestimate of their capacity of mischief. It is true that in settled political states, like England and hitherto North America, freemasonry was comparatively innocuous. In these countries it is under no restraint or condemnation, since its essential principle of religious indifference is, for the most part, held in honour, yet Masonic fanaticism still exists in certain lodges and in individuals in a sufficient degree to connect them morally with their continental brethren.

Masonry makes itself simply ridiculous when it effects great antiquity, and in imitation of the legends which naturally attach to the Catholic Church invents mythical fables, which have neither historical nor poetical value. It is still more absurd when it pretends to the possession of mysteries and secrets,

and when, aping again the Catholic Church, which makes use of holy words at the Consecration of the Mass for a most real and sacred purpose, it mouths and mumbles unmeaning words into the ears of the initiated. When grown up men make use of cabalistic signs and senseless words, it is done, either as a bait to entrap the unwary or to mask under frivolous and puerile observances real and mischievous designs.

The object of Masonry is clearly defined by a zealous Mason, who some years ago in a German periodical (*Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, No. 13) set up a defence of his order:—"The Masonic bond," he says, "is to unite what states, churches, and social differences keep apart. The opposition against Jesuitism and Obscurantism perhaps, in the beginning, made deceptions necessary, for the conscience of many a right-believing Catholic could only be quieted at the cost of the ancient and simple form of Masonry. This justice must be done to the Roman hierarchy," he continues, "that they recognized earlier and more clearly the aim and the extent of the society, and were more steadfast in their views than many of the members of the order itself." In another passage he says, "Leaving dogmas untouched, and teaching that every form of belief should be outwardly respected and honoured, the society restricts itself essentially to the highest, but unfortunately too often misunderstood, doctrines of its Founder,\* and aims at making these doctrines the active and fruitful principles of life. Masonry may be called," he concludes, "the religion of men out of their nonage. Hence the unmovable hatred of the hierarchy against it." Indifferentism then, on this writer's own showing, is the true and proper principle of Masonry.

But it is capable of proof that the principle of indifferentism in religion carries in itself the germ of active hostility against the Catholic Church. As an illustration of the necessary hostility between the two antagonistic principles, represented respectively by Freemasonry and the Catholic Church, we need only refer to Belgium. In no kingdom save, perhaps, in unhappy Portugal, does Masonry possess greater power than in Belgium; and in no country do the Masonic lodges, by means of the Government and of the press, show a more virulent and determined hostility against the Church. Wherever there is active and stirring life, there can be no truce between these two principles. A Mason and a Catholic, if each is true

---

\* "Jesus of Nazareth is the Grand Master of the Order," is the teaching of one of the higher Masonic grades—in one of the highest it is blasphemously interpreted as meaning that belief in our Lord destroyed the unity of the Godhead.

to his creed, can no more mix than fire and water. The motto of the Voltairian lodge is *ecrasez l'infame*; and the Church is always pronouncing against these secret and Masonic societies its *anathema*. But these societies are as dangerous to the State as to the Church. The Masonic principles of equality, of liberty, of universality, tend to destroy civil authority, the obedience of subjects, and patriotism.

In the following discourse\* to the "Illuminati dirigentes," Scotch knights, such a tendency is most clearly visible; it commences with sore complaints of the low condition of the human race; and it deduces the causes of this state from religion and State-government. "Men originally," it says, "led a patriarchal life, in which every father of a family was the sole lord of his house and his property, while he himself possessed general freedom and equality. But they suffered themselves to be oppressed—gave themselves up to civil societies, and formed states. Even by this they fell; and this is the fall of man, by which the race was thrust into unspeakable misery. To get out of this state, to be freed, and born again, there is no other means than the use of pure reason, by which a general morality may be established, which will put man in a condition to govern himself, regain his original worth, and dispense with all political supporters, and particularly with rulers. This can be done in no other way than by secret associations, which will, by degrees, and in silence, possess themselves of the government of the States, and make use of those means for this purpose, which the wicked use for obtaining their base ends. Princes and priests are in particular, and *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the wicked, whose hands we must tie up by means of these associations, if we cannot root them out altogether. Kings are parents. The paternal power ceases with the incapacity of the child, and the father injures his child if he pretends to retain his right beyond this period. When a nation comes of age, their state of worship is at an end." If the foregoing discourse of the Masonic teacher be an evidence of the levelling and anarchical character of the sect—a character which is transparent in all their discovered writings—the following note, appended to the instructions given at the ceremonial† of reception, shows the intriguing spirit they are taught to cultivate. "N.B.—We must acquire the direction of education, of church management, of the pro-

\* Nachtrags-Original-Schriften. Neueste Abtheilung, 1787.

† At the highly symbolical ceremonial of the reception of a Masonic candidate, crowns and sceptres are represented as tokens of human degradation.

fessorial chair, and of the pulpit. We must bring our opinions into fashion by every art, spread them among the people by the help of young writers. We must preach the warmest concern for humanity, and *make people indifferent to all other relations.*"

The origin of Masonry in its present form, it seems to us, then, is not so much to be sought in remote antiquity as Masons pretend, or in those impious and anarchical associations which arose in the most disturbed periods of the middle ages, as in the irreligious condition of society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. That the principles of Masonic and secret societies are essentially subversive of religion, morality, and civil order, is a proposition which the study of the secret political history of the last or present centuries, we believe, would amply substantiate.

The part which Freemasonry has played in the world during the century and a half of its existence, the revolutions, moral and material, which it has done so much to effect; the crimes which, in the name of liberty and of philosophy, it has committed against society and against God, and the triumphs which it now enjoys in Europe, will form, when it comes to be written, no insignificant chapter in the moral history of our times.

But since the Masonic lodge is the breeding and birth-place of those societies which are now the inevitable plague-spots of Europe, it is not out of place for us to trace, as far as we are able, consistent with necessary brevity, the course of this evil propagandism.

Not the least significant of its present triumphs is the acceptance which Masonic phrases have found in the common language of the day. By dint of perseverance they have wrenched from words their right and original significance. The Masonic conspiracy has made our noble language subservient to its purpose by attaching new ideas to our old phraseology. The words "progress," "perfectibility," "civilization" may serve, for instance, to illustrate our meaning. These conspirators against our language have attached to the word progress a pantheistical idea, such as makes it compulsory on those who wish to guard against misconception to qualify its abuse by prefixing civil or material to the term. Progress, pure and simple, has come to mean the development of man in knowledge and power until he has become like unto God. The *perfectibility* of man does not now mean the individual's power of arriving at moral and spiritual perfection by means of prayer and mortification; but the possibility of mankind collectively achieving a certain intellectual and

physical completeness through the labour of philanthropists. Civilization, again, contrary to the hitherto usage of our best writers, is now applied to express *material* welfare, instead of being restricted to describe mental or moral enlightenment in a nation.

The corruption of language is indeed a manifest evidence of a long foregone corruption of ideas, but this corruption of the minds of men was the primary aim and appointed task of the Masonic societies. To the best of their power they aided in the development of that intellectual infidelity which was so conspicuous in Germany at the close of the last century; and in France they prepared the way for the triumph of the great revolution, and for the reign of terror. They went systematically to work to accomplish these ends. It cannot be denied that the moral soil of Europe was but too well prepared to receive these seeds of evil. Hence, Masonry, imported from England, struck root at once in France and Germany, and in other parts of Europe, and rapidly developed its fantastic forms and its anti-social principles.

Numerous as were the disturbing and corrupting elements in the Europe of the eighteenth century, none was more concentrated in its force, or more universal in its action, than this esoteric society. The influence of the deistical writers of England, the general corruption of morals under Louis XV., the atheistical and revolutionary philosophy of Germany, were all made use of and directed in secret conclave for the attainment of the great end in view, the overthrow of the throne and of the altar, and the dissolution of all civil society. Freemasonry, indeed, was split up into numerous sects, many lodges were innocent of the anti-social conspiracy, but "a society," as Frederick v. Schlegel observes, "from whose bosom as from the secret laboratory of revolution, the Illuminées, the Jacobins, and the Carbonari, have successively proceeded, cannot possibly be termed, or be, in fact, very beneficial to mankind, politically sound, or truly Christian in its views and tendency." Its plea of universal benevolence was but a cloak to mask its anti-social and un-Christian designs. Its true character is to be found in the hidden and internal history of the French Revolution—of that Revolution, which has become a generic term to describe the great European conspiracy against the existing order of things, whose focus is at Paris, but whose scattered rays are to be found in every secret lodge throughout the world.

Freemasonry was imported into Germany and the north of Europe somewhat later than into France. The first German lodge was erected at Cologne in 1716, but before the year



1725 there were many, both in Protestant and Catholic Germany.

Those of Wetzlar, Frankfort-on-the-Main, Brunswick, and Hamburg, are the oldest. All of them received, we are told, their institution from England, and had patents from a mother lodge in London. All seemed to have got the mystery through the same channel—the banished friends of the Stuart family. Many of these were Catholic, and entered into the service of Austria and the Catholic princes. Schism after schism divided the Masonic body; adventurers and cheats professed to teach new mysteries, or imported from France modifications of the order. In 1743, Baron Hunde returned from Paris, where he had been initiated by the Earl of Kilmarnock, and by some other gentlemen about the Pretender, into some wonderful secrets of their lodges, and showed to his friends in Germany his extensive powers of propagating a new system of Freemasonry. In 1756 or 1757, the French officers, who were prisoners at large at Berlin, undertook to instruct the Germans in the Rosaic system, and in half a year Freemasonry underwent a complete revolution. In 1764, a new revolution took place. At a convention held at Altenburg, Baron Hunde, the Grand Master of Germany, introduced a new system called strict disciplinarians (*strict Observanz*).

"Hunde declared," says the author of the "Proofs of a Conspiracy," "that his whole estate should devolve on the Order; but the vexations he afterwards met with, and his falling in love with a lady who prevailed on him to become a Roman Catholic, made him alter his intention." Dissension and bitter enmity broke out between the strict disciplinarians and the importers of the French degrees; the former soon fell into decay. The Rosaic lodges, under the parent lodge of Berlin, were distinguished by infidelity and laxity of moral principle. The French lodges had all emanated from the Great Confederation under the Duke of Chartres, and it was to be expected that the German lodges, formed on the French model, should cultivate the same principles which characterized that sect.

Owing to the encouragement of Frederic II., the fellow conspirator with Voltaire against Christianity, these Masonic societies redoubled their attacks against religion. Scepticism and infidelity were openly preached. By means of a licentious press, the public mind of Germany was perverted, and the morals, not only of the wealthy, but of the lower ranks, were corrupted.

"The Scriptures, the foundations of our faith," says the Protestant writer whom I have already quoted, were examined

by clergymen of very different capacities, dispositions, and views, till by explaining, correcting, allegorizing, and otherwise twisting the Bible, men's minds had hardly anything left to rest on as a doctrine of revealed religion. This encouraged others to go farther, and to say that revelation was a solecism, as plainly appeared by the irreconcilable differences among those enlighteners (so they were called) of the public, and that man had nothing to trust to but the dictates of natural reason. Another set of writers, proceeding from this as a point already settled, proscribed all religion whatever, and openly taught the doctrines of materialism and atheism. Most of these innovations were the work of Protestant divines.

Teller, Semler, Eberhardt, Lessing, Bahrelt, Riem, and Schultz were the most conspicuous of those who in Protestant Germany perverted the surviving verities in the reformed religion. But the most efficient member of this confraternity to overthrow all belief in Christianity was Nicholai, an eminent and learned bookseller in Berlin. He was the publisher of a periodical work called the Universal German Library (*Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*). This work, owing to its learned dissertations and to its numerous and favourable reviews of all such works as were written by the Philosophers either of Germany or of France against religion, obtained a large circulation. The plan of the work was conspicuously unfair; no notice whatever was taken of books written in defence of religion, whereas none were too profane or too atheistical for its praise and assistance.

Another plan which he adopted with great success, was to revile every Protestant defender of Christianity as a Jesuit in disguise. He raised a hue and cry throughout Germany against the Jesuits, asserting that the order was only apparently abolished, and that, under the secret protection of Catholic princes, they were still working for the restoration of religion.

This indefatigable Mason, for he was introduced into the Rosicrucian order by his two reverend friends, Gedicke and Biester, publishers of the *Berlin Monatschrift*, and equally with himself devoted to the Masonic doctrines. Not satisfied with the advantages he enjoyed as editor of the "Universal German Library," he exerted to the same diabolical ends his influence on the book-trade of Germany, for Nicholai was not only a reviewer but a bookseller, and had presses in the different cities of the Empire. In the great book-fairs held at Leipsic and Frankfort twice a year, he contributed not a little by his influence among the booksellers who speculate in these great literary markets, to the sale of sceptical and irreligious

writings. Heinzmann, a bookseller at Berne, published an excellent work on this infamous Masonic plot to corrupt the literature of his country. The title of this book was : "Appeal to my Country concerning a combination of writers and booksellers to rule the literature of Germany, and form the public mind into a contempt for the religion and civil establishments of the Empire." The work contains an historical account of the publications in every branch of literature for about thirty years. The author ascribes the prodigious change which had taken place, not to the simple operation of things, but in a great degree to a combination of trading infidels. Another plan hit upon, not very dissimilar in design to Voltaire's agricultural colony in Paris, was the setting up of an academy of general education called a Philanthropine. This institution, as its name denotes, was intended by its founder to be a seminary of practical ethics. The morals of the pupils were to be attended to rather than languages or the sciences. Love of mankind and virtue were the great end of the education ! The practical difficulty was to combine Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists in one religious system. Basedow is described as a man of talents, a good scholar, and a persuasive writer, and we are told that under the pressure, which was brought to bear upon his scheme by innumerable suggestions and plans for uniting the three Christian communions (as they were called) of Germany, Christianity, the common ground-work, was refined and refined till it vanished altogether, leaving Deism or philosophical religion, as it was termed, in its place. Basedow made repeated alterations and corrections, but not one Catholic came to the Philanthropine.

If we reflect on the political action and influence of Masonry we shall discover here also its debasing and immoral tendencies. Traces, for instance, exist of the manner in which, during the seven years' war in Germany, Frederic II. made use of his Masonic connections and of his relations with the Encyclopedists of France, not only for the purpose of controlling and influencing the course and conduct of the war, but of opening up treasonable correspondence with French officers of rank in the field. There were many suspicious circumstances about his secret correspondence with the enemy's camp. At the battle of Rossbach, for instance, a French general, Saint-Germain, instead of hastening to the aid of his sorely-pressed comrades, stood with a considerable division of French troops idle, at a short distance from the field of battle. "Such conduct," says Stühr in his interesting work on the seven years' war, "will appear the more ambiguous to those who remember that Frederic II. had sent to him from Erfurt his

royal greetings." The Prussian king's secret correspondence with the French generals appears to have been conducted by his reader, the Abbé de Pradt. This unfortunate priest, a writer in the notorious 'Encyclopedia,' had to leave France on account of his open hostility to religion, and was recommended by D'Alembert to Frederic II., who always received with open arms the apostles of philosophic infidelity. This systematic treachery goes far to account for some of those wonderful successes which were proclaimed from many a Protestant pulpit in Saxony, as public signs of the Divine protection of the Protestant cause, or which, by the flatterers of the philosophic king, were attributed to the marvellous results of his singular genius.

"Freemasonry boasts," observes Professor Robertson, in his able and comprehensive lectures on Freemasonry, "that its brethren, when by chance they encounter each other on the battle-field, are led by signs of mutual recognition to save each other's lives."

On the death of Voltairian Frederic, under whose evil auspices these antichristian associations openly displayed their tactics, an attempt was made by his successor to check these evil-doers. Frederic William of Prussia published an edict in support of all the religious establishments of the country. It was assailed with the utmost virulence. Walther, an eminent bookseller and publisher at Leipsic, published some of the most atrocious of these attacks. He was the publisher also of many of the sceptical and licentious writings which were then demoralizing Germany, as well as an associate and friend of the most advanced Masonic leaders. The King of Prussia's edict on religion became at once the butt for sceptical abuse and ribaldry. The Masonic societies now opened a systematic assault on civil as well as on religious institutions. The rights of princes were unscrupulously attacked. The most daring of these attacks issued from the Masonic presses of the infidel Nicholai, in the form of anonymous letters on the constitution of the Prussian States; these letters were ascribed to Mirabeau. To the French edition, or translation, even still more violent, his name was appended. In this work the monarch is described as a tyrant, the people are addressed as a parcel of tame wretches crouching under oppression, and are called upon to rise up and assert their rights. The king is told that there is a combination of philosophers who are leagued together in defence of truth and reason, and which no power can withstand; that they are to be found in every country, and are connected by mutual and solemn engagement, and will put in practice every means of attack. The

triumph of reason over error, the overthrow of superstition and slavish fear, freedom from religious and political prejudices, and the establishment of liberty and equality—the natural and inalienable rights of man—were the topics of general declamation; and it was openly maintained that secret societies, where the interchange of ideas was free from every restraint, were the most effectual means of enlightening the world. The profanation of Christian doctrine, the revolt against civil authority, and the licentiousness of the press which, by inflaming the passions, sought to weaken the hold of religion, were the persistent work of the Masonic lodges. The universality and the identity of purpose in these attacks against the King of Prussia's edict on religion, as well as the sympathy and co-operation which they received from the confraternity in France, bespoke their origin. About this juncture Baron Knigge, from the neighbourhood of Frankfort, an enthusiastic Mason from his youth, although averse to French Masonry, imagined that he discovered in their sceptical and cosmopolitan discourses glimpses, as he describes it, of hidden truths. Eventually he declares that the French orators in the lodges were right without knowing it, and that Masonry was pure natural religion and universal citizenship, and that this was also true Christianity. He published also a popular system of religion,\* in which Christianity is held up as a mere allegory, or a Masonic type of natural religion, and the moral duties are degraded into a system of universal benevolence. The general tenor of the work is to make men discontented with their condition of civil subordination, and with the restraints of revealed religion.

Such was the disturbed and disorganized state of German Freemasonry in the year 1776. It was on the 1st of May in that year that Weishaupt, a professor at Ingolstadt, in Bavaria, and a sworn enemy of the Jesuits, laid the first formal foundation of that secret society, which afterwards became so notorious under the name of Illuminism. His position at the university gave the opportunity, which he plied to the utmost, to corrupt the minds of the young men entrusted to his charge. Returning to their native places, these young men became his zealous apostles. Writing to one of his chief adherents, whose adopted name was Ajax, he says, with the blasphemous impiety common to the sect, "Did not Christ send his apostles out into the world? Why should I leave my Peter at home? Go, then, and preach."†

---

\* Vide extracts in "*Religions-Begebenheiten.*"

† Original Writings, Letter to Ajax, 19th Sept., 1776.

Weishaupt particularly enforced on his adepts the advantage of gaining recruits among the professors and schoolmasters, as a sure means of gaining over the youth of all classes. To one of his adepts, who was superior of the college at Landsberg, he gives the special commission to watch and guard against the Jesuits as sworn enemies of the education he is to give to his pupils.\* At his own university at Ingolstadt, the Jesuits, after the suppression of their order, still retained their office of public teachers; hence the vehement entreaties of Weishaupt to the adepts at Munich, to beset the ministers, and to obtain the expulsion of all Jesuits. He complains that these fathers had retrieved the four professors, Scholliner, Steingenberger, Wurzer, and Schlegel, from Illuminism, and that he had but three professors left in the university to resist Jesuitism.†

In another letter he asks for some brethren well drilled in the arts of insinuations, who might be sent to the universities of Salzburg, of Inspruck, of Freiburg, and of other places.‡ The craft found many of its most zealous supporters among the professors and students, and its lodges were soon spread all over Bavaria and Franconia. The following note on the progress of Illuminism was written by Cato-Zwack, one of its chief apostles:—"We have at Athens (Munich), 1st, a regular Lodge of Major Illuminees; 2nd, a lesser meeting of Illuminees very well adapted to our purposes; 3rd, a very large and remarkable Masonic lodge; 4th, two considerable churches or Minerval academies . . . . All the scientific journals are procured for the brethren at the expense of the Order. By means of different pamphlets, we have awakened the attention of the princes and citizens to certain remarkable abuses; we oppose religious orders with all our might; and we have good reason to be pleased with the success of our endeavours . . . . We are in treaty for a strict and effective alliance with the Lodge of —, and with the National Lodge of Poland." Another note by the same hand runs thus:—"Through the intrigues of the brethren, the Jesuits have been dismissed from all the professorships; we have entirely cleansed the University of Ingolstadt of them.§ The Dowager Duchess has modelled her Institute for the cadets entirely on the plan prepared by the Order. That house is under our inspection; all its professors belong to our

---

\* Vol. I., Let. 28.

† Vol. I., Let. 36, 30th Jan., 1778.

‡ Vol. I., Let. 40.

§ Durch die Verwundung der Brüder wurden die Jesuiten von allen Professorstellen entfernt und die Universität Ingolstadt ganz von ihnen gereinigt.



Order; five of its members have been well provided for, and all the pupils will be ours. On the recommendation of the brethren, Pylades is made the ecclesiastical fiscal councillor. By procuring this place for him, we have put the Church moneys at the disposal of the Order; and by means of these moneys, we have already repaired the mal-administration of our — and of —, and have delivered them from the hands of the usurers —. With these moneys we also support new brethren. The brothers who are in orders have all been provided with *livings* and *curacies*, or with preceptor's places. Through our means, too, the brothers Armenius and Cortez have been made professors in the University of Ingolstadt. On the recommendation of our Order, two young men are travelling at the *expense of the Court*. They are at present in Rome. The Germanic schools are all under the inspection of the order, and have no other prefects than our brethren. The Benevolent Society is also under our direction. The Order has obtained an augmentation of pay and salaries for a great number of brethren, who are employed at the boards of administration. We have obtained four ecclesiastical chairs for as many of our brethren. We shall shortly be masters of the Bartholomew Institution for the education of young ecclesiastics; by this means we may stock all Bavaria with priests both clever and proper. We have similar hopes and views on another house of priests."

These two notes on the public policy of this secret conspiracy against religion and civil order throw a singular light on the inner and hidden history of European revolutions.

Here we have men bound by a secret oath, and acting under an organized and secret government, dismissing by their intrigues Jesuits from their professorships, filling the chairs of the Universities, modelling Military Institutes on plans prepared by their Order, and subjecting the pupils to their inspection. Church moneys are placed at their disposal to rescue members of the order from the hands of the usurers, or to fill their purses for new enterprises. They reward with livings and curacies the brethren whom they have thrust into Holy Orders. At the expense of the Court, these agents of the revolution are sent on foreign travel. They have obtained ecclesiastical chairs for the brethren of the Order, and have brought under their control institutions for the education of young ecclesiastics; in order by this means, as they confess, to stock Bavaria, at least, with priests both clever and proper. Need we ask how revolutions succeed; how kings are beheaded, or driven into exile; how Christianity is trampled out; how universities are made the hot-beds of infidelity; how monasteries

are suppressed or confiscated? Here we have mapped out before our eyes the chart of public corruption, every road and cross-cut that most rapidly lead to moral ruin are marked out. Although the Court of Bavaria shrank from publishing the names of those ministers of State and others who played into the hands of this secret society, it is but too clear that the power it exercised in public affairs was gained by bribery, by infamous treachery, or by intimidation. Thus it is that the religion, the education, the civil government of nations are sacrificed to a secret power which stands behind the throne and rules in the dark. If so infamous is the public conduct, what is the private character of these sworn brethren who fill responsible offices in the state, or who put on the sacred livery of the Church in order secretly to undermine what they cannot carry by open assault? Let Weishaupt speak for his followers. In a letter, which we cannot here reproduce, he describes his own immoral conduct (his only fear was exposure), and the atrocious means to which he had resorted to preserve the mask of his pretended virtue; and now he upbraids his first adepts with the public depravity of their morals, as being prejudicial to his Illuminism, and as exposing the founder of the Order to be looked upon as the corrupter of youth.\*

In 1781, a Masonic congress was convened under the protection of the Duke of Brunswick, the Grand Master of the Masons of Germany, and of the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel. It was composed of men of all stations of life, of noblemen, of men of large wealth and power, and of brothers of the craft possessing great knowledge and activity. These men, bound by a secret oath, were the agents and deputies of secret societies in all parts of the globe. They came from all corners of Europe, from Asia, Africa, and America, in thousands, to attend this Congress. The number of Freemasons was variously estimated, at from one million to three millions. The *Loge de la Candeur* at Paris, in its circular letter, supposes that France alone contained one million. Dr. Stark (one of the most learned writers of the sect), in his work on the ancient and modern mysteries, positively says, that at the lowest computation the number of Masons at that time must have amounted to one million.†

This Masonic Congress was held just nine years before the outbreak of the French revolution, and twelve years before the Reign of Terror. If we reflect on the fact that the greater

---

\* Vol. ii., Let. 2.

† Abbé Barruel, *Memoirs of Jacobinism*.

part of the Masons in this Congress were already infected with the revolutionary principles, which were afterwards publicly proclaimed in 1789, and that most of its leaders, initiated in higher degrees than the three first of simple Masonry, had already openly avowed anti-social and atheistical ideas, we cannot fail to see in this Masonic Congress one of the more immediate causes of the French Revolution. In such a school, men quickly learnt the lessons of impiety and anarchy. This Secret Congress, torn with schisms and factions, inflamed by jealousies and the rivalries of party-spirit, fomented for purposes of their own by the Illuminists, broke up after more than a month's sitting. The intrigues, however, of the advanced Masons of German Illuminism, such as Weishaupt himself, Baron Knigge, and the Italian Mason, Marquis of Constanza, enticed vast numbers of the Masons into the higher degrees; and eventually, with the co-operation of the lodges of Frankfort, and of Wetzlar, and of others, these men succeeded in forming out of various existing combinations, a new system of Masonry called the Eclectic or Syncritic Masonry of the united lodges of Germany. Thus on the dispersion of this great Masonic Congress, its members, initiated in the doctrines of German Illuminism, carried back with them into the countries whence they came, and especially into France, impious, immoral, and anarchical ideas, more sure and deadly in their action than the knife or the bombs of the midday conspirator. The Masonic ideas of equality and fraternity were but too soon written in letters of blood on the streets of Paris, and on the palace of the Kings of France; whilst the meaning of the Masonic regeneration of mankind was only too visibly explained in the hideous massacre, at the Carmes, in the closed churches of France, and on the altar of Notre-Dame.

The convention of Wilhelmsbad gave an immense impetus to the new system of Masonry. "By the combined efforts of Knigge and Bode," says a moderate Mason, "the greater part of the lodges throughout Germany were tainted and infected with this baneful Illuminism,"\* a few only of the lodges held out against this intrusion. One lodge at Berlin, under the name of the Three Globes, published, in 1783, a circular letter anathematizing all brethren who should pretend to degrade Freemasonry so as to transform it into a society of men conspiring against their God and their country.† But the report of the sect itself informs the illuminizing directors that, of all the legi-

---

\* Discourse of a Master on the ultimate fate of Freemasonry.

† Abbé Barruel.

timate lodges in Germany, there is only one that has not coalesced with our superiors, and this lodge has been obliged to suspend its labours.\*

The vast increase in the numbers of the sect and its consequent audacity, led to its suppression in Bavaria; Weishaupt was dismissed from the University of Ingoldstadt, together with fifteen of his pupils. The archives of the sect fell into the hands of the Government, and were published by the authorities, under the name of *Original Writings* (*Original Schriften*). But according to its avowed tactics, the sect appeared again under another name, and setting defiance to all authority, increased still more the general fermentation of the public mind in Germany. But the interest and energy of the Masonic leaders were now concentrated on France. It can scarcely for our purpose be necessary to do more than allude to the practical development which the ideas and principles of this association took in France, and which found their fitting climax in the shameless immoralities, the bloody butcheries, and the open atheism of 1793. But before doing so we must take a rapid glance at the secret schemes and struggles of Freemasonry in the great empire of the north.

It would, indeed, have been surprising had not the enlightened spirits, who were compassing the French Revolution, also sought to make Russia happy with their licentious liberty of mind and body. No period could have been more favourable than that when frivolity and libertinage were personified in Catherine II. of Russia. Voltairianism, as well as the Protestant tendencies which since Peter I. had crept in among the Russian clergy, found in the Masonic lodges, already widely spread in the reign of Catherine II., willing and active support. It was under Peter III. that Freemasonry presented its Protestant side, for that monarch was so much taken up with Protestant ideas and sympathies as not even to conceal their public exhibition. Of him it is related that when, after attending with his whole court the solemn consecration of a Lutheran garrison Church, he was shortly afterwards invited to attend a similar ceremony in the "orthodox" Church, instead of going there in state he walked out with his gun and shot swallows. The form under which the Russian lodges of Masonry fraternized with Voltairianism, was the false mystical system of Illuminism propounded by Saint Martin. To spiritualize truth, which he contended was petrified in Catholicism, was the aim of his Theosophy. Although at home his system had been far

---

\* Abbé Barruel.

outstripped, yet it was not badly chosen for Russia under Catherine II. The hope could not reasonably be cherished of dragging Russia so abruptly as France into the abyss of revolution.

Saint Martin had no great success in France, although he was not without influence in the lodges of Lyons and Montpellier; but his doctrines were zealously propagated among all the Masonic Lodges in Russia by Count Grabianka, a Pole, and by the Russian Admiral, Plestcheyff. The object of this Masonic propaganda was to publish works of a "moral and religious" tendency. They busied themselves in translating works, especially from the French, on literature and science. They spent more than a million of francs on a library for public use, which chiefly "consisted of religious books;" they founded a school of their own, and attracted from foreign parts, as well as from Russia itself, students whom they educated in their system. Nowikoff\* was the soul of the Society. He sought by his writings "to spread useful knowledge and to combat prejudices." He established a scientific and a popular review, the profits of which were to be spent on popular schools. This indefatigable bookseller founded, also, at Moscow, "a Typographical Union." Every member of Freemasonry, says Count Krasinsky, took part in these noble works not only by gifts but by personal exertions, by influence over relations and friends, and by his own example. Krasinsky had no doubt that the Saint Martinists would soon give a great expanse to Russian civilization, "For," he says, "they not only spread scientific and literary knowledge in the different classes of society, but they strove also to awaken a *religious spirit* in the National Church; that the Masonic lodges were gradually extending over the whole empire their beneficial influence became every day more apparent; they gained recruits from among the most eminent men of Russia, statesmen, men of science, merchants, and booksellers; they counted, also, in their ranks some high dignitaries of the Church, as well as simple priests." But, alas! for these Masonic dreams; Catherine II. had learnt experience from the French revolution, whose chief instigators were wont so inordinately to flatter her pride. She now started back from the path they had pursued, and put an end to these secret intrigues against religion and civil order. "The French revolution," says Krasinsky, "warned her off in fear from ideas of reform, and she would now give herself no more trouble with the enlightenment of her subjects, except to prevent it. She

---

\* Histoire des Peuples Slaves, par le Comte Valerian Krasinsky. Paris: 1853.

mistrusted the writings of the Freemasons, and especially of the Typographical Union. Nowikoff was sent to the fortress of Schlüsselburg; Lapuchin, Prince Nicholas Trubetzkoi, and Turgeneff, were banished to their estates; the works of Arndt, Spener, of Jacob Böhme, and of others, which were merely made use of by the Freemasons as a cloak for Voltaire and Rousseau, of whom Catherine II. had grown mistrustful, were burnt, as dangerous to public security." Count Krasinsky passes over in silence the Voltairian character of Freemasonry in Russia, and only presents its Protestant side. Herzen, a writer who was not troubled with such scruples, says that "the first earnest effect which impressed another stamp on the literary dilettantism of Russia came from Freemasonry, which, towards the close of Catherine's reign, was very widely spread in the Empire. Its head, Nowikoff," he continues, "was one of the most prominent personages in history of those who effect wonders on a stage which must of necessity remain enveloped in darkness; he was the bearer of those subterranean ideas whose work is only seen at the moment of the outbreak of revolutions." He then goes on to describe the character of the works translated, articles from the Encyclopedia and other such writings, as, he pertinently remarks, no government would allow to be published in our age. No sooner was Catherine aware that Nowikoff had entrapped Paul, the Imperial heir presumptive, into the craft, than she made short work of Bible societies which were spread over the Empire, of the pseudo-mystical journals, and of the whole system of Masonic enlightenment. But Masonry waited its time, and prepared its revenge for the rude stop which Catherine had put to its work. But it is now time to follow, in a country so ripe for its work as France, the development of this secret and impious craft to the top of its bent.

Ever since the commencement of the last century, Freemasonry, with its subtle Pantheism and its revolutionary politics, had been at work in France, corrupting the hearts and perverting the minds of men; and in this work of corruption its task was made comparatively easy by that league against Christianity which had Voltaire, and D'Alembert, and Diderot for its leaders, and Frederic of Prussia for its royal patron. Things were in such a state in France that the infusion into the Masonic Lodges of German Illuminism, was the one thing wanted to set the kingdom in a blaze. Mirabeau, who had been initiated at Wilhelmstadt, imported into France the organization of the sect; and, under the new impulse and direction, the Liberty and Equality, and the scepticism preached by Voltaire and Rousseau, found their practical and necessary issue in anarchy



and atheism. In the Grand Orient of Paris, all the regular lodges of the kingdom were represented. In 1727, in two hundred and eighty-two towns of France were to be found regular lodges under the direction of the Grand Master. "In Paris alone," says Abbé Barruel, in his *Memoirs*, "there existed eighty-one lodges, sixteen at Lyons, seven at Bordeaux, five at Nantes, six at Marseilles, ten at Montpellier, ten at Toulouse: in short, in almost every town, the lodges were in a pretty just ratio to the population." The Grand Master of the Masons of France was Philip of Orleans—that Philip of Orleans whose vices revolted even the stewards of Paris, whose blasphemies startled the clubs, and whose paid guards, recruited from the lowest rabble of the suburbs of Paris, stormed the Bastille, and at Versailles gutted the palace of his royal master and kinsman; he was that royal sans-culotte, in fine, who fraternized with the dregs of the populace of Paris, and who went by the name of Philip Egalité.\* This was the Grand Master, who, not content with dominion over the Masons of France, issued his instructions to the lodges of Chambéry in Savoy, of Loch in Switzerland, of Brussels, of Cologne, of Spa in Belgium, and to the lodges of Warsaw, of Moscow, of Portsmouth in Virginia, of Port Royal in Grenada, and to the lodges in all the French colonies. In the lodge of the *Nine Sisters*, we find the unfortunate Duke de la Rochefoucault; and there, too, appears the familiar name of Condorcet, together with the names of the chief *Philosophers*, as they were called, of the day. Thither, too, came apostate priests, such as Noel, Pingré, and Merlot, and Lalande and Dom Gerles. As to Abbé Sieyès, he had formed a new lodge at the Palais Royal, called the Club of the Twenty-two, whilst his disciple, Lafayette, in the Loge de la Candeur, was already preaching up the *Rights of Man* and the sacred duty of *insurrection*.

Into such lodges, then, as these, the deputies of German Masonry were introduced. Instead of the uncouth and unfamiliar names of Weishaupt, of Knigge, of Hertel, and of Zwack, we

---

\* Philip Egalité was seen among that mob, which, headed by the half-naked Mademoiselle Théroutanne, the *favorite* of the day at the Palais Royal, dragged the unfortunate King and Royal family from Versailles to Paris, where they were received by the rabble of Paris with shouts of derision and with the cry, "We now need starve no more, for we have got the baker and his wife, and the little apprentice." It was, perhaps, owing to some remote association with this seditious salutation, that the cry "*Où est Lambert, et Madame Lambert, et le petit Lambert,*" which a year or two ago was shouted out from end to end of France, was so nervously suppressed by the Government.

meet now in the French lodges with names which bear a horrid celebrity—a Philip of Orleans, a Mirabeau, a Sieyès, a Condorcet. In the Hôtel d'Holbach, after the manner of their German prototypes who now came amongst them, a gang of infidel writers and revolutionists had long been established. Their writings—coarse, and sensual, and impious—were circulated from lodge to lodge, and scattered far and wide among the people. No house was safe from the vile intrusion. Every means was used to inflame the passions and darken the minds of men. The coarse but witty jest, horrible in its profanity, leapt from mouth to mouth; the ribald song rung in every ear; every eye was polluted by the indecent prints that stared from the shop windows of Paris.\* Refrains such as the following dropped from every lip of these votaries of Satan:—

“Tous les rois et tous les prêtres  
Sont des fripons et des traîtres.”

The most impious sarcasms, and the coarsest abuse, and the most atrocious blasphemies, jostled against one another. *Ecrasez l'infâme* was at the foot, like an unchristian Amen, of the vilest of these productions. It need scarcely be stated after this that the honorary President of the Club, Hôtel d'Holbach, was Voltaire, and that among its most notorious members were D'Alembert, Diderot, Condorcet, La Harpe, and Turgot. This confraternity, which represented almost every kind of vice and every shade of infidelity, from Pantheism to open atheism, boasted of the patronage of Frederic II. of Prussia, whom they called the Solomon of the North, of Catherine II., of Gustavus, King of Sweden, and of the King of Denmark. It has been truly remarked that *Philosophism* has descended from the thrones of the North into the universities; it may also as truly be added that from the universities it has descended in a practical form into the streets. Between the 10th of August, 1792, and the 1st of January, 1794, upwards of two hundred new plays were acted in the Parisian theatres. Their immorality and barbarism exceeded all conception. All the voluptuous sensuality of ancient Rome was brought on the stage. Nothing was spared that could corrupt the eye or inflame the passions, or nourish the hatred of all subordination.† Barrère declared from the Tribune of the Convention that—

\* It is noteworthy that the very same means which were used by the agents of the secret societies in Paris before the great revolution are now employed in Italy to demoralize the people. Visitors to Italy are shocked at the indecent and blasphemous prints in the shop windows, and at the immoral publications which are now forced into circulation. The purpose is as obvious as it is degrading.

† Barruel.

"The insipid and simpering Racine only softens the heart. Crebillon—Crebillon without breeches—this is the writer that suits Republicans." The Masonic evil has almost reached its climax. The most visionary of the Rosicrucians and the Martinists, as has been well observed, became the most outrageous of Jacobins; but now all conspired together in the last attempt against religion and civil order. The man who had sworn to stamp out Christ had gone crying in vain for a priest to judgment. His disciples, however, lived to carry out his views. They passed away out of the petty assemblies of the female free-thinkers who ruled Parisian society—such as the Duchess d'Anville, the Marquis du Deffont, or the Geoffrins, Espinaces, Neckers, and Staels. They forsook the Hotel d'Holbach itself and the lodges, and from the threshold of the notorious Jacobin Club, stepped into the foremost ranks of open revolution. Here, in motley confusion, jostled together Sansculottes, royal dukes, philosophers, apostate priests, nobles, hired assassins, gangs of the very dregs of the people, with the weapons of Philip Egalité in their hands and his money in their pockets. This horrid crowd, fringed by women, and excited by their frenzy and by the fearful imprecations which issued from their hissing, serpent-like mouths, flung themselves into that gulf of nameless horrors which had long been prepared. Acting on Voltaire's suggestion, with the bowels of the last priest to strangle the last king, they massacred the priests wholesale, they murdered the King and the Queen, and declared that henceforth there was no God.\*

Enough had not yet been done to accomplish the wickedness which had been conceived in the innermost conclaves of the secret societies. A substitute had to be found for the God whom they had dethroned: so they raised a woman on the altar of the living God, the *hominum deorumque voluptas*. Impiety could go no further; blasphemy had done its worst. But how was this blasphemy at the Cathedral of Notre Dame different from that conceived by Weishaupt in his *Eroterion*? "We do not," said this high-priest of Masonry, "call you to the worship of inanimate idols. Behold a master-piece of nature" (at Notre Dame this was an actress, Mme. Barbier). "This sacred image should inflame all hearts." It

---

\* During the whole of the riots, whether at the Town Hall or at the Carmes, the real signs for rallying and fraternizing with the brigands were Masonic.—*Barruel*. During the reign of terror the Masonic grip saved many a life.

did so; the people shouted out, "No more altars, no more priests, no God but the God of Nature."\*

After such an exhibition of public atheism, after the King-murders and the massacres of priests, which had been committed in the name of liberty and of equality, and for the regeneration of mankind, we need not glance at the public and private immoralities, more easily imagined than described, which were the inevitable consequences of that comprehensive scheme of ruling society without a civil governor, and of regenerating mankind without God. When excess had reached its lowest depths, reaction set in. Out of the social chaos the empire of force arose. In the place of moral power overthrown, brute force triumphed in the land of the revolution, and France ever since has oscillated between Socialism and the military dictator. Europe trembled under the rebound of the French revolution, and wisely seeing in these secret societies the terrible secondary causes of that social upheaving, and regarding them as the most unscrupulous agents which the ingenuity of malice could devise for the overthrow of society, suppressed Freemasonry altogether, or at least put it under restraint.

In 1794 it was suppressed in Austria; and in Bavaria, in 1799, it was absolutely prohibited; and about the same time it was put under restraint in Prussia. Before this time the Grand Master of the craft in Germany suspended the association on account of its grave offences against civil order and religion. History tells us with sufficient distinctness to what uses Napoleon put Freemasonry. The Military Dictator tolerated no open or secret rival of his Empire; under his rule no power should grow up behind his throne. He made Freemasonry his slave, and it served him well and wisely too, for its keen-sighted adepts saw how in reality Napoleon promoted their cause in Europe. To secret understandings with the craft, Napoleon, in Germany, like Frederic the Great, owed several of his most surprising successes in negotiation. Bavaria, for a long time, to the degradation of Germany, linked itself to his fortunes, and Bavaria had been the hot-bed of Masonry. But not to rest the grave accusation of disloyalty merely on such a deduction, we put it simply on the historical fact, that the lodges of the Rhine and in Saxony invited Napoleon into Germany; whilst the Masons of Mainz and of other towns offered to deliver them up to Marshall Custine. Patriotism is not a Masonic virtue. The aim of the craft is to free men from such narrow

---

\* Robison, "Proofs of a Conspiracy."

boundary-lines as those of country and of creed, and to enfold all mankind in the bonds of a creedless and countryless society.

In the pursuit of this end these sectaries are unwearied. After the reaction caused by the atrocities and the lawlessness of the French Revolution, these secret societies, justly suppressed by the civil power, had to work like moles underground and in the dark. Every means were lawful in their hands; as they were no longer allowed an open propaganda they had recourse to intimidation, slander, treachery, and to secret assassination.

This secret plague was by no means stamped out. The right cure for the evil was not applied by the rulers of Europe, who, on their restoration, soon forgot their fears, and busied themselves only in Court frivolities, or in promoting a miserable political absolutism. Napoleon had dallied for his own ends—which were his only rule of life—with Masonry. But the kings of the Restoration period desired to root out the evil, but instead of trusting to the Church for the regeneration of society, hung chains round her limbs and stopped her free speech. Politicians, wise in their own conceit, thought they knew better than God's Church how to deal with the moral, social, and religious disease of Europe. The only remedy they could offer was a most pitiable bureaucratic system, which stifled by its intolerable weight all individual freedom, handed the child over to the State to educate according to its lights, and all but enslaved the Church of God. Against the plots of the secret societies the rulers set up spies everywhere. Hence arose mutual suspicion and distrust between the people and their kings. In France, especially under the Restoration, religion, paraded about too much as a court favourite, lost real influence over the people. The repression without the application of a thorough-going remedy soon led to a renewed activity on the part of the secret societies, ever ready to turn circumstances and to shape events, where they could, to the profit of their evil designs.

Mindful of its unfinished work in Russia, and aware of the religious and political weaknesses, and manifold corruption in that huge, semicivilized empire, the secret societies recommenced there the work of destruction. Masonry and the secret irreligious propaganda, alternately favoured and repressed by the rulers of Russia, at length, on the stern suppression of all such agencies by Alexander, appealed to their last and most dangerous weapons. A conspiracy was set on foot to murder the Emperor of Russia, and to create a provisional Government of which Prince Trubetzkoi, son of the noto-

rious Freemason in the reign of Catherine II., was to act as president. Indeed, the younger conspirators, such as Trubetzkoi and Prince Galitzin, were for the most part sons of the elder Masonic plotters and schemers. Indeed, a few of the Masonic Martinists of the earlier period were still active enough to take the foremost rank among the conspirators of the 14th of December, 1825. Tungeneff was one of these; he was now himself the Grand Master of Masonry. Nowikoff, the most turbulent leader of the Masonic movement in Russia during the last century, as we have mentioned, although he died in 1818, was clearly implicated in this infamous conspiracy. According to documentary evidence, it was shown that he was the prime mover and most active member in that revolutionary Society, "the Bond of Salvation," organized on the Masonic plan, where the conspiracy was hatched which was discovered on the accession of Nicholas to the Imperial throne. It was proved on the trial, that this terrible conspiracy of the 14th December, 1825, received its secret means, its esoteric organization, and its subterranean mode of action, from the Protestant Masonic Propaganda, which for so long a time had been spreading its network over the vast Empire of the North.

In the decennium of which we are now speaking, the Masonic and kindred societies, with the characteristic common to them all, were busily plying the work of revolution. In Spain and Portugal they were successfully helping to overturn ancient dynasties, to confiscate church properties, and to suppress monasteries and convents. By dint of persistent slander and unscrupulous lying in the European press, the Masonic party endeavoured, and not unsuccessfully, to alienate the sympathy and support of the Conservative powers from those unhappy countries. The Masonic principles triumphed, and as a consequence kings lost their crowns, the Church was persecuted and plundered, and society was completely demoralized. Anarchy has had its own way, and revolution has been the normal state of these two countries for a quarter of a century. Portugal is still completely under Masonic sway, and Spain is on the brink of another revolution. In the Belgian revolution of 1830, the Masonic party so far triumphed as to make the fundamental principle of Masonry, religious indifference, the basis of the Belgian Constitution. Belgium is the first and at present the only state in Europe which has done such public homage to the Godless principle of government. Such an act, whatever excuse may be urged for its commission, has produced incalculable mischief, for it has not only made Belgium the centre of Masonic activity and propagandism, but it has ren-

d



dered even good Catholics so familiar with the political maxims of Masonry as almost to reconcile them to the existing constitution of Belgium.

But it was in France, since 1789 the classic land of revolution, that the evil of secret societies broke out afresh with somewhat of its former virulence, and with its old spirit of propagandism. Out of a Masonic lodge at Paris arose a secret association, which adopted the name and practice of the Italian Carbonari. The Italian Carbonari themselves were members of a secret conspiracy which was already plotting in those Italian States, into which constitutions uncongenial to the character, and unfitted to the habits of the people, had been imported from abroad. These secret societies in Italy, which at a later period developed such large and destructive proportions, owed their origin, partly to the perhaps unwise settlement of 1815, and partly to the corrupting bureaucratic system of government, as well as to that revolutionary propagandism which has made Italy its home, and has perverted to its own vile ends Italian patriotism. From Italy, then, this association of Carbonari was imported into France.

Three young men, Buzard, Flobard, and Budrez, founded a society of this character on the 21st May, 1821. "These three unknown men," says Louis Blanc, in this matter no prejudiced witness, "met on that day in a house in one of the poorest quarters of Paris. Here arose the Carbonari, which, in a few months, set France in a blaze. These young men had established a Masonic Lodge, 'The Friend of Truth,' and had received into this lodge, which was principally devoted to purposes of a political and revolutionary character, a great number of artisans and apprentices." From this lodge chiefly arose the disturbances which, after the murder of the Duke of Berri, in 1820, convulsed Paris. Late in the summer of the same year, after the military conspiracy had been crushed, the principal members of this lodge migrated to Naples, which was then still in open revolt. Here also the revolution and the Carbonari were put down. The French members, on their return, brought with them back to Paris exact accounts of the Italian Carbonari, and from their hands the council of the Masonic Lodge, *Friend of Truth*, received the written constitution of the Italian Society, which it at once caused to be translated into French. Upon this basis was raised the French Chabonnerie.

The main purpose of the conspiracy was the introduction of a constitution founded on the sovereignty of the people; but to each one was left the right to interpret its views as he chose, or as seemed best to answer the purpose of the regene-

ration of the world. Its organization was as follows: it was ruled by the "Alta Venta," which originally consisted of the seven French founders, with power to add to their numbers. Every venta was in itself a completely organized body, its chief was in communication with the "Alta Venta," though the members were kept in ignorance of the names of their co-conspirators.

It was punishable with death for one Carbonaro to be a member of more than one venta. Besides the civil Chabonnerie, there was established a military society of the same name, but completely independent of the civil society, and under different rulers; the possession of a musket was an absolute condition, as strict military obedience was the absolute duty of the military Carbonaro. Secret drill was nightly practised in private rooms, whose floors were strewn with straw and sand, to prevent detection. Every means were employed to enrol new numbers, and to entice soldiers from their allegiance. After a time the leaders of this secret society began to distrust their own powers; they accordingly applied to the leaders of the Revolutionary Committee, as it was called in the Chambers, whose secret sympathy and support they had always relied upon, to take the direction of the association. The proposal was made to Lafayette, whose vanity and intriguing spirit led him to accept the offer.

The real advantage of this connection with the Director of the Committee was that the young Carbonari, furnished with letters of recommendation, were able to prosecute their work on a larger scale, and to cover the whole of France with a network of conspiracies. Towards the end of the year 1821, military revolts were prepared and excited by the agency of the Carbonari in many towns, such as Rochelle, Niort, Colmar, Breisach, Nantes, Belfort, Bordeaux, and Toulouse. These riots were put down with a severe hand by the government, the ringleaders of the Carbonari were put to death, numbers were banished, and terror was struck into this wide-spread association to such an extent as to lead to its dissolution.

Anarchy, says Louis Blanc, entered in at all the pores of Carbonarism, and in its train came unjust suspicion, hatred, egotism, and personal ambition; the time of submission was past, that of intrigue began. The single lodges were emancipated from central control. There were Calvinist, Republican, and Bonapartist lodges; some conspired only for the sake of conspiring; the freer, in the commencement, the plan of this society, the greater now was the anarchy which set in.

Above the angry din of the social conflict which resounded

through Europe, the voice of the Popes was heard solemn and clear. In the sentence of condemnation which they pronounced on the secret societies, and on the irreligious principles which they represented, there was no uncertain sound. As in the Constitutions of Clement and Benedict in 1738 and in 1751 the Freemasons were condemned, so both the Freemasons and the Carbonari were excommunicated by Pius VII. in 1821; and Leo XII., besides renewing the constitutions of his predecessors, condemns all secret societies whatsoever (bearing certain specific marks, which are described) as hostile and dangerous to the Church and to civil governments. The Rev. Dr. Murray,\* of Maynooth, speaking in reference to certain questions proposed by the Archbishop of Naples, in 1821, to the Sacred Penitentiary, concerning the secret societies, says that "as time rolled on, the true anti-christian and anti-social tendency of the secret society system developed and displayed itself more unmistakeably and more fully. Hence, among the grounds of condemnation of the secret societies in the Constitutions of 1821 and 1825, we have, their furious and satanic hatred of the Vicar of Christ—their league of secret murder—their avowed atheism—their conspiracy against all legitimate authority, in the State as well as in the Church. These hideous and hellish developments the sovereign Pontiff affirms were made known to him from the most authentic sources of information."

All these condemnations were confirmed by Pius IX. in the Encyclical "*Qui pluribus*," on November 9th, 1846, on the eve of that convulsion which shook almost every throne in Europe, and which for awhile put the leaders of the secret societies in possession of the Eternal City itself. But this great revolution, also, was preceded by unusual activity in the Masonic body.

In May, 1847, a European Masonic congress was held at Strasburg, which was attended by Lamartine, Cremieux, Cavaignac, Caussidière, Ledru Rollin, Louis Blanc, Proudhon, Marrat, Vilain, and many others, whose names are less familiar, as representatives of the order in France; there were present also, as leaders of the German republican party, Fickler, Hecker, Herwegh, von Gagern, Bassermann, Ruge, and Robert Blum, of the Frankfort Parliament, who, for treasonable practices,† in 1848, was executed at Vienna. It is a noteworthy fact that, as the great Masonic congress of 1785, in Paris, was followed in a few years by the first French revolution, in

\* Appendix to Professor Robertson's Lectures.

† Der Freimaurer-Orden in seiner wahren Bedeutung. —E. E. Eckert.

which the horrible principles of the secret clubs were openly put in practice, so, after this later congress, revolution again broke out almost at once in more than in the half of Europe, and precisely in those countries where the secret societies were most numerous. The outbreak in Switzerland was the first act of the great European revolution. In this civil war the independence of the Catholic cantons was overthrown, and the Sonderbund suppressed. At the head of the Radical army, in which Sir Robert Peel was a demonstrative volunteer, was that General Dufour who was connected with Spanish rebels and Freemasons, as well as with Mazzini. The Swiss revolution afforded a proof as to the complicity of the Masonic sect with Mazzini and his antisocial conspiracy, which fact receives additional confirmation from the following information, which was given in a Masonic journal of Germany.\* We are told by this authority, which in such matters may be trusted, that the Belgian minister Nothomb (a Masonic apostate) declared to the notorious deputy Verhagen, in the presence of six other deputies, "that Masonry now in Belgium, in the hands of certain men, had become a powerful and dangerous weapon, that the revolt in Switzerland owed its origin to the machinations of the Belgian lodges; that brother Defaegz, Grand Master of the Belgian lodges, had gone thither solely for the purpose of making preparations for that movement. Repressed, now in this country, now in that, the revolutionary movement always found support, as the Belgian minister declared, in the Masonic lodge, until at last it succeeded in effecting another general outburst. The spread of these seditious principles has retarded, even more than the absolutism of despotic princes, the development of popular freedom and self-government. Weishaupt and Mazzini have proved themselves far greater enemies to liberty than Frederic II. or Joseph of Austria. The effects of this conspiracy against religion and social order were seen in 1848. At a given signal, in almost every country in Europe, the members of the secret societies rose in rebellion. The similarity in the course, and the simultaneousness in the outbreak, of these revolutions, but too clearly declared their origin.

The leaders of the secret societies, themselves, shrank at first from the fearful contest at Paris, whose issue was so dubious; and it was not until they beheld the throne vacant and saw in motion that mighty mass of *prolétaires* excited by the collapse of authority and by the hoisting of the republican flag, that they ventured to place themselves at the head of the

---

\* *Latonia*, viii. p. 129.

movement. The friends of royalty bowed powerless before the sudden storm. They had neither faith nor hope. The ground on which they stood had no stability for them. Even such of them as supported the republic out of necessity did not believe in its principles or sympathize with its ideas. How, then, is such a state of things as then existed to be accounted for, except by ascribing it to that spirit of political rationalism which, since 1791, has undermined the institutions and sapped the faith of society in France? And who is to hinder the principles inscribed in every paragraph of the Civil Code from invading the political constitution, and from successfully grappling with the existing governments for supreme power? And why wonder or be alarmed at the practical triumph of principles whose theoretical errors are so flattered and cherished? After the victory of democracy in 1848, due, indeed, more to the impulsive masses than to the secret leaders, it was the rights of property alone that drew the line of demarcation, and formed the basis of resistance to the onrush of revolution. Against the socialistic manifestations of the national workshops and clubs—against the communistic exhortations of the leaders of the secret societies, the National Guards made a significant and unmistakable stand. It was the battle, not of principles but of material interests; it was the resistance of all such as had something to lose, against those who, in the triumph of communism, had everything to gain. Hence the cry—social order is in danger, property is in danger; hence the terrific bloodshed of the days of June; hence the triumph of Napoleon; and hence, chiefly, the Empire, which receives support or tolerance from good men in France only because, for the time, it preserves society from dangers, and from the triumph of principles worse or more destructive than its own.

If we trace the history of the revolution of 1848 chronologically, we cannot but see in its suddenness and completeness the action of the secret societies, whose organization throughout Europe is directed against the established order of things.

On the 24th of February, the revolution of Paris overthrew the monarchy; on the 27th, a meeting of the publicists of Germany was held at Frankfort, which commenced the federal revolution in Germany; on the 15th of March a revolution broke out in Vienna, which led to the fall of Metternich; on the 18th an insurrection in Berlin forced concessions from the king, and led to a change in the political system of the country; and on the same day there was an insurrection of

the Milanese against the Austrians. The 21st of the month was signalized by the abdication of King Louis of Bavaria, who refused to tamper with the revolution, or to cede an iota of his royal authority; on the 23rd the King of Sardinia appealed to the people of Lombardy and Venetia to rise in a war of independence! and two days later the revolutionary democrats of Germany marched into the Danish duchies, and the revolution broke out in Schleswig and Holstein, which, after having been beaten back by the conservative principles and forces of Europe in 1848, has in the present year signally and disgracefully triumphed in the convention of Gastein; on the 25th, still of the same month, an insurrectionary parliament was opened in Sicily; and on the 31st the German Notables assembled in the "Vor-Parlament" at Frankfort. In continuing the catalogue of the successes, no longer subterranean, of the secret societies of Europe, we come to the dethroning of the King of Naples and his dynasty, by the Sicilian parliament, on the 13th of April; and on the 28th, to a socialistic revolution at Rome. But need we go further in this catalogue? is not the action evident, of these hidden leaders, in the public triumph of their principles of socialism and anarchy? The violence of their measures, however, best bespeaks their origin. Look at the attack on the Constituent Assembly of France by the armed bands of the societies on the 15th of May. On the same day there was an insurrection at Naples; but a victory was gained by the royal troops—their generals had not yet been bought by the gold of the arch-leader of the European conspiracy. On the same day as this outbreak in Naples there was an insurrection in Vienna, and two days later the Emperor of Austria was a fugitive in Inspruck. On the 22nd of June began the struggle between the revolutionary socialists and the defenders of property, during which the streets of Paris ran with blood. The revoltion broke out anew in Vienna on the 6th of October, about the affairs of Hungary, and the capital of Austria was only rescued from the hands of the revolution by the gallant Croats. On the 12th of November a festival of the democrats was celebrated in honour of the proclamation of the new French constitution, and on the 15th the Pope's prime minister, M. Rossi, was assassinated by the orders of the secret societies at Rome; and on the 24th the Pope had to fly from the Eternal City, and take refuge with the King of Naples at Gaeta. The stronghold of Christendom was converted into the head-quarters of the secret societies. It is needless to allude further to this sacrilegious triumph. To attack the Papacy is to shake the whole order of Christian society,



and the first step towards the triumph of socialism and unbelief—the aim of all these associations—is the overthrow of the temporal principedom of the Pope. But the triumph of the revolution in 1848 was not for long. Rome was rescued from the power of the secret societies by gallant soldiers, sent forth by the Catholicism of France, to drive out of the sacred capital of Christendom Garibaldi and Mazzini, and their cosmopolitan gang of socialists, democrats, and infidels. Everywhere the revolution was stamped out by military force or put down by the strong will of Christian peoples. The public mind of Europe had not yet been thoroughly demoralized, nor the political union and interdependence of nations so entirely broken up as at the present moment. But with the craft common to the lower reptiles, the secret leaders of revolution slunk back to their dens to recommence in secrecy their work of demoralization. Kings, startled by the nearness of danger, and recognizing the remedy, gave her liberty back to the Church. Hence, and specially since 1848, all the power of the Masonic societies is directed against the renewed freedom of the Church, against the temporal principedom of the Pope, against Catholic education, against the religious orders, as against a deadly enemy with whom no compromise is possible, no truce to be thought of. This aim is betrayed in every proclamation which Mazzini, from his secret shelter, sends forth to stimulate his satellites or to corrupt the weak or unwary. He who placed a lapis-lazuli-hilted dagger in the hands of an intending king-murderer was not, as we may easily imagine, very scrupulous in the means he used in the pursuit of his ends. To establish the “Socialist Republic, one and undivided,” he aims at the destruction of both priest and king. Garibaldi, the priest-hater, was a mere tool in his hands. Victor Emmanuel is only tolerated for a time by the chief of the secret societies. “Italy,” says Mazzini, in one of his addresses, “is still what France was before the Revolution: she wants, then, her Mirabeau, Lafayette, and others. . . . The essential thing is, that the goal of the great revolution be unknown to the rich and influential; let us never allow them to see more than the first step. The people has yet to be created; it does not understand the revolutionary teaching of the secret societies; but liberty (he says), rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity, are what the people will understand, above all when opposed to the words despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery. The difficulty is not to teach the people, but to get it together. . . . The army,” he adds, “is the greatest enemy to the progress of socialism. . . . Clerical power is personified in the Jesuits. The odium of that name is already a power for the socialists. Make use of it. . . .

Associate, associate! Everything is in that word. The secret societies give irresistible strength to the party that can call upon them. Do not fear to see them split: the more the better. When a great number of associates, receiving the word of order to spread an idea, and make it public opinion, shall be able to concert a movement, they will find the old building pierced in every part, and falling, as if by miracle, at the least breath of progress. They will be astonished themselves to see flying, before the single power of opinion, kings, lords, the rich, the priests, who formed the carcass of the old social edifice. Courage, then, and perseverance!"

The secret societies, especially in Italy, propagated these doctrines with unabating energy; they ensnared the young by appeals to a false patriotism, by bribery, or by still more infamous arts. They made use of the errors of men like Gioberti, or even of Rossini, to dazzle and mislead the people. Whatever was rotten in society they scented out like a ferret, and batten on like carrion-birds. Had there not been a widespread laxity of principles in Italian society, the success, it must be confessed, of the revolutionary societies could not have been so great as it has been. The rulers of Italy fashioned, for the most part, the rods for their own backs. They hampered the free action of the Church; they interfered with the liberty of education. The State too often tyrannized over, instead of being guided by, the Church.

The influence of the secret societies spread rapidly, especially in the universities. New organizations\* were promoted, and desperate crimes were from time to time committed or attempted, in order to shock and unsettle the public mind. The Italian press was cunningly handled, and a great deal, which could not be publicly advanced, was secretly insinuated; but the most atrocious calumnies, which invention could hit upon, were boldly circulated throughout Europe, chiefly by the agency of the Masonic societies, and were, though refuted by persons conversant with their falsehood, repeated on every occasion, and in almost every society. The notorious letters of Mr. Gladstone to Lord Aberdeen were a signal instance of the success with which the secret partisans of the revolution imposed upon the credulity or prejudice of strangers. These letters, † containing the grossest charges that could be trumped up against the late

---

\* There was an organized body in the secret societies called the "Stabbers;" and in Sicily dead bodies from the hospitals were set up against the walls on which these men learned to practise their deadly art.

† The *Revue des deux Mondes* even expressed its regret at the time that Mr. Gladstone should have made such charges in so passionate a manner, corroborated by no evidence, or based at best on *ex parte* statements.

King of Naples, were sent by the late Lord Palmerston to every court in Europe. From some of the governments, the Prime Minister of England received a severe rebuke, not only for lending an ear to the common and notorious calumnies of the revolutionary societies, but for giving currency to charges against an allied king, which had not been established by any trustworthy evidence. The King of Naples refuted by public documents, and by sworn evidence, the charges manufactured in the dark, and so blindly and passionately accepted by Mr. Gladstone. But the Masonic societies had gained a signal triumph. By the aid of an English minister, the Italian revolution became a European question; no longer was it talked of only in secret societies or in the democratic press, it was now debated in cabinet councils and in diplomatic notes. This change gave a mighty impulse to the movement. England became the head-quarters of the revolution; hither flocked Mazzini and his most trusted conspirators, whence, under a feigned name, he kept up an incessant correspondence with the secret societies of Italy and of Switzerland, and at his leisure fraternized with English liberal politicians. Here too were hatched desperate conspiracies, and here were manufactured murderous bombs. But in spite of the most frantic efforts, and the most passionate appeals, the Italian peoples would not rise in revolt; nor would European statesmen furnish a pretext for universal anarchy. The secret societies were put on their mettle; lots were cast, and the Orsini bombs precipitated Napoleon into the arms of the Revolution. The unfortunate Emperor had taken the oath of the Carbonari; when in his youth he was a refugee and a conspirator in Italy, he knew death was the penalty of its violation; he was but too familiar of late years with the rule of the society\* which declares that not even the altar of God, far less the Imperial throne, shall shelter the victim from its vengeance. There was no escape. The revolutionary flag was hoisted in Italy.

---

\* *Rules of the Mazzinian Societies.*—I. The Society is formed for the indispensable destruction of all Governments of the Peninsula, and to form a single state of all Italy in Republican form. II.—30. Members who will not obey the orders of the secret society, and they who unveil its mysteries, shall be poniarded without remission. 31. The secret tribunal shall pronounce the sentence, pointing out one or two associates for its immediate execution. 32. The associate who shall refuse to execute the sentence shall be held perjured, and as such put to death on the spot. 33. If the victim succeed in escaping, he shall be pursued incessantly in every place, and the guilty shall be struck by an invisible hand, were he sheltered on the bosom of his mother or in the tabernacle of Christ. . . . 54. Each tribunal shall be competent, not only to judge guilty adepts, but to execute all persons whom it shall devote to death.

It was the intervention of Napoleon on behalf of the Masonic and secret associations, against the Church and civil governments. From that day to this the secret societies have triumphed. They have upset thrones, trampled on the altar, outraged morality. But more still remains to be done; and this 'more' they are ready to do. They will continue to act as they have hitherto acted. They will calumniate, lie, suborn false witnesses; they will conspire and revolt, and, if needs be, stab in the dark as heretofore, or as heretofore commit midday assassination. There is no stopping short, and no relenting, for the oath binds to the end, and the spirit which induced the taking of the oath, and long familiarity with crime, and the triumph of success, all combine to hold their victim as in a death-grapple. The approval of, or the acquiescence, so far, of the governing classes in Europe in the work of the secret societies, encourages further excesses. No work is well done by halves, and whatever work of evil has still to be done, we may be sure that such remaining work will be, we do not say accomplished, but attempted.

So things stand to-day, and such is the part which Masonry and the societies which have sprung from its bosom have played in the world. This terrible agency has made use of the demoralization which it found ready made to its hand, and which has to be attributed to various causes remote or near, permanent or transitory, deep-seated in human society or resting merely on the surface; but this demoralization of the public conscience, whatever its cause, has received during the last quarter of a century such a development as to leave the Pope, the highest representative on earth of moral power, of social order, of supernatural law, almost alone face to face with his public enemies.

What a picture is here presented to us! Evil of every kind coalesces against Pius IX. Every hand that has touched pitch is raised against the Pope; every tongue that speaks evil rails against Rome. The bright intelligence or the scientific mind that has fallen away from God is turned against the Papacy. Coarse passions, low interests, or cultivated indifference, are all directed against the Church. Things the most common and the most subtle combine. But the Papacy breaks the bonds which shackle modern civilization, unstops the ears of men, and speaks with a voice which is heard in every part of the world. Pius IX., in his famous Encyclical *Quanta Curâ*, condemned the philosophic rationalism and the godless liberalism of modern society in a tone so distinct and so decisive that none henceforth can be deluded as to the character of modern thought or the principles of modern politics.

And now, in the Allocution of the 25th September \* against the Masonic societies, he has condemned also the secret and active agents who rudely put into practice the ungodly and anti-social theories taught or insinuated by the intellectual leaders of modern progress. In the face of this vast conspiracy against Christianity, the only safe or satisfactory course open to Catholics is to close their ranks, and be in all things of one heart, of one mind, and of one will with Rome. Such a unity is a strength peculiar to Catholicism ; it is an armour without flaw, a weapon without fault, and a token of victory.

To substitute humanitarianism, then, for revealed religion is the chief Masonic aim ; so if there were no Church, there would be no need of Masonic lodges. Between the Church of Christ and the Mason's lodge there is, consequently, an everlasting enmity. To belong to a lodge, a man must forswear the Church and deny Christ, or else act in invincible ignorance of the principles of the craft, forgetting that indifferentism on principle to all religion leads out of Christianity and into pure Pantheism. This is the great evil of Freemasonry. We have not spoken here of the darker rites and of the awful blasphemies committed in these secret societies—rites more awful, because blasphemously sacrilegious, than the one by which Wilkes, on his initiation into the Hell-fire Club, pretended to give communion to an ape. To increase the horror which these societies ought to inspire, we need only refer to the fact that in Belgium and in Italy abandoned women have been sent into the churches during early Mass to commit an awful sacrilegious theft in order to enable these secret sects to perpetrate, at their midnight worship, the most hideous and diabolical blasphemies that the heart of man could conceive—blasphemies which could only come direct from that lodge whose grand-master is Satan.

---

\* In reference to this Papal Allocution on Freemasonry, a letter of a threatening character was lately addressed by the secret societies of Paris against the highest dignity of the English Church, on his return from Rome.

## ART. VII.—THE NEW PARLIAMENT.

1. *The Shilling House of Commons for 1866.* London : Hardwicke.
2. *Dod's Parliamentary Companion for 1866.* London : Whittaker & Co.

THE Parliament of 1865 can hardly expect to be a Long Parliament. In the brief interval that has elapsed since its election, events have happened of the kind that orators and public writers generally associate with the beginnings of new eras, and that are in the annals of the House of Commons, on the other hand, ordinarily followed by dissolutions. Lord Palmerston, who sent the last House to the country a little before it should expire under the Septennial Act, and to whom the new House was supposed to have brought back from the country a renewed vote of confidence and a considerably increased majority, has passed suddenly away from the Hall to the Abbey ; and the new House will meet a new leader in the person of Mr. Gladstone. It was supposed that all over the country there was a distinction taken during the election between Lord Palmerston's personal domestic policy, which was supposed to consist in staving off further parliamentary reform, and that of Mr. Gladstone, Lord Russell, and several of his other colleagues, who are supposed to favour a reform almost radical in its character ; and it was calculated that a large proportion of the new majority were of Lord Palmerston's way of thinking, rather than of the section of the Cabinet whose views had the support of Mr. Bright. But now this section of the Cabinet has become the head and front of the Government ; and Mr. Bright has announced, not exactly officially, but at all events authoritatively, that there is to be a Reform Bill proposed next session, and that he is content with its provisions beforehand. Nothing can indicate the complete revolution of the Cabinet that has followed Lord Palmerston's death so strikingly as the fact of Mr. Bright appearing in the character of its oracle. Had this happened (only that it is an absurdity to conceive its happening during Lord Palmerston's life at all) in the interval between the Reform debate of last session and the dissolution, it may fairly be doubted whether the great Liberal party would have come back from the country in such full force.

The death of the King of the Belgians is another of those events which instantly alter the aspect of a wide tract of



human affairs. The last Parliament, contented with the invention of the phrase and policy of non-intervention, only discussed foreign affairs after the manner of a debating society—sometimes, when the fall of Poland and the fate of Denmark were bewailed, after the manner of the Union; sometimes, when Mr. Whalley and Mr. Layard had their fling, after the manner of Cogers' Hall. But as, while Lord Palmerston lived, the majority of the English people believed that everything went well, and that after his death there must be a deluge of some kind or other—an ugly rush for the franchise, at all events,—so the common sense of the country has seemed to regard the life of King Leopold as staving off certain continental complications, to which the phrase non-intervention might not possibly prove a specific placebo. The eagerly-expressed desire of the French Emperor to recognize the new king, even before he had taken the constitutional oath, is of course calculated to be very reassuring to those persons who have so read his Imperial Majesty's history as to find that he has always strictly observed his oaths and undertakings. But that the French want to have and will have, some day or other soon, and some way or other fair or foul, Belgium, and then the frontier of the Rhine, is a fact as well believed in Europe as that Prussia means to annex, and is preparing for annexation, the Danish duchies. It is what may be called the last European question remaining open to English policy. Lord Palmerston, thinking his word would serve the purpose, told the Danes that if they were attacked by Germany they should not stand alone: but the Germans did not believe the noble lord, and the result proved they were right. There can hardly be a doubt, however, that Lord Palmerston would have at once declared war, if in his time a French army had violated the Belgian frontier. It may be doubted, however, whether his successors would do more than make such another idle outcry as they did about Savoy and Nice. And when the French are at Antwerp, it only remains for Mr. Bright to ask, What is the use of our maintaining so many ambassadors abroad with nothing to do?

How the new Parliament will envisage such questions, he would be a rash man who should presume to predict. It is a new Parliament in more than the ordinary sense of the word, having that large proportion of members, who have never sat in the House before, on its roll, which is always the result of an election after a Parliament of prolonged duration. Many of the new members, too, are men of distinguished abilities and established public character. It is possible that the influence of such men with the House will be considerably enhanced, and to some at least of them an official career more

easily opened, by the death of Lord Palmerston. At present the Government is worse represented in the House of Commons than any English ministry since Mr. Addington's. Mr. Gladstone, indeed, may be spoken of like Gylippus, as having concentrated in himself all the virtues and all the talents of his party. But his party dread for the Chancellor not merely the fatigue of having the almost unrelieved burden of debate thrown upon him, but far more, the trial to his somewhat sensitive temper of leading the House. Here, however, it is probable the public will be agreeably disappointed. It has been said that we owe a very model of American Presidents to the rigid and atoning vigilance which Mr. Johnson has exercised over his whole public conduct ever since the unhappy indiscretion which created such a grievous impression on the morning of his inauguration. So Mr. Gladstone has been lectured and expostulated beforehand on the score of his temper to that degree, that it is not impossible he may carry tact and suavity to the pitch of a Fine Art, far surpassing the adroitness and *bonhomie* which sprang from Lord Palmerston's natural levity. Mr. Gladstone, however, will probably have more trouble in managing his colleagues than in sustaining his own inordinate share in debate, or reproving the ebullitions of impatience and *ennui*. Mr. Cardwell, who ought from age and experience to be his most efficient lieutenant, is lamentably unfitted by character to bear the pressure of such a complex and exciting question as the Jamaica Massacre. Sir George Grey and Sir Charles Wood may be regarded as invalids, equal still to the routine of official life, but utterly incapable of taking any useful part in the arduous contests of Parliament. Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Charles Villiers are not exactly feeble in the same sense, but no one will feel very sanguine that the result of a division may be turned by their authority or eloquence, if during the next session either is seen to rise in the small hours of the morning after Mr. Disraeli or Lord Stanley. This exhausts the list of Cabinet Ministers at present belonging to the Lower House. It seems hardly possible that a government, and especially a government charged with the carriage of a measure of Parliamentary Reform, should consent to meet the House of Commons in such trim; but it is obviously difficult to effect any solvent arrangement. The gentlemen of sufficient authority in the House of Commons to be received into the Cabinet are separated by curious gaps from its policy. Mr. Lowe was in the natural order of promotion for the vacant Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster; but, apparently believing that Lord Palmerston would live for another Parliament, Mr. Lowe

made a bitter anti-Reform speech last session, which renders it hardly consistent with decency that he should take office now. Mr. Horsman, who has exhibited on certain set occasions eminent debating faculty, appears to be as absolutely separated by his peculiar idiosyncracies from the portfolio. Mr. Bright says his time to take office has not yet come. When Mr. Gladstone considers the character of his subordinates, his reflections cannot be much more cheering. Sir Robert Peel is gone, and that is assuredly a relief. But Mr. Layard, who is as bad a specimen of the coarse and rather "rowdy" class of subordinate whom Lord Palmerston preferred, remains at the Foreign Office; and, from the nature of his business and his long connection in it with the Premier, is likely enough to be little tractable to Mr. Gladstone's management. How Mr. Forster, considering the line that his political friends are taking touching Jamaica, will conduct himself as Colonial Under-Secretary, in connection with a chief who is believed to be disposed to support Governor Eyre as far as he dare, may be among the most interesting studies of the Gallery. Mr. Goschen is universally expected to distinguish himself, and probably a popular subordinate never had so fine an opportunity, as the leadership of Mr. Gladstone (who can afford to be more tolerant than the Whigs of outside intellect), and the present weakness of the Cabinet, are calculated to give him. It cannot be denied that the Government, in replacing Sir Robert Peel as Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant by Mr. Chichester Fortescue, have made an excellent appointment in itself, and by far the best appointment that was possible to them. Mr. Fortescue, an Irish member of now nearly twenty years' Parliamentary standing, has a considerable acquaintance with the condition of his country. He has excellent abilities, hitherto lacking that opportunity of exercise which in the practice of government the charge of one independent department can alone give. In manner, temper, and character he is the most absolute contrast to Sir Robert Peel that can be conceived. Whether, however, he will have "the courage of his convictions," and make his Irish administration, like Mr. Drummond's, an era in the history of his country, remains to be seen. As yet there is no reason to be sanguine of seeing Irish affairs brought within the region of high conscientious statesmanship. Sir Robert Peel's administration cannot be said to have been a failure, for he knew what he meant, he said what he thought, and he did what he wanted to do. This is what the circumstances of the case enable every ill-disposed official, who has direct power, to do in Ireland. On the other hand, nothing can be conceived

more ignominious than the failure as Irish secretaries of such men as Mr. Horsman and Mr. Cardwell, whose ambition must have been moved by the opportunities which that country affords to a statesman of signalizing his administration by great acts of public justice, but who, in the end, left Ireland not quite clear in point of conscience, and with a damaging consciousness of their incapacity in state-craft brought home to their own minds, as well as to the general sense of the empire. The new Irish secretary is likely, from local and personal, as well as general reasons, during the next Parliament, to occupy an exceptionally prominent place among the officials outside the Cabinet. And it is unnecessary further to consider their calibre. The subordinates of the Government are, on the whole, as dull a lot as ever dozed on the Treasury Bench. The Attorney-General may, indeed, be named as an illustrious exception to the prevailing imbecility of that section of the Administration; but an Attorney-General is, by the jealousy with which official lawyers are generally regarded by the House, and the considerable amount of business actually connected with his department which is always before Parliament, rather restricted from giving any very effective general service to his party. It is enough to try the courage of even so sanguine and gifted a politician as Mr. Gladstone, conscious of so much weakness and inaptitude on his own side, to confront the imposing force which fills the opposite bench. Several of Mr. Disraeli's principal supporters are by no means remarkable persons. But there are seven of them, Sir John Pakington, General Peel, Lord Stanley, Mr. Sotherton Estcourt, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Henley, and Sir Bulwer Lytton, who speak in debate with the moral authority that the fact of having held Cabinet office always confers in the House of Commons; while some of the subordinate officers of the administration of Lord Derby, such as Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Hugh Cairns, Mr. Whiteside, and Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald (for whom a seat will probably be found ere long), are among the most popular speakers in the House. Mr. Gladstone will probably have in a considerable degree to depend on the volunteer assistance of members officially unattached to the Government; and nothing in a constitutional state is more calculated to damage the strength of a ministry.

The position of the Government in the House of Lords, on the other hand, appears to be, if anything, too strong, or, as the French say, *un peu trop fort*. The First Lord of the Treasury, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Secretary of State for War, the President of the Council, the Lord Privy Seal, the Post-

master General, the Lord Chancellor,—eight out of the fourteen actual Cabinet Ministers, four of them holding the most important offices, confront, not on very equal terms withal, the great Conservative chief. Owing to the curious weakness of the Tories in clever peers, Lord Derby has to do in the House of Lords habitually what Mr. Gladstone is now expected to attempt in the Commons, the Government being about as strong in one House as the Opposition in the other. But there is a vast difference in the amount of labour involved. It is told of Lord Clarendon that when the rumour ran of the Queen's intention to make him a Marquess for saving the empire in 1848, he said, "I wish her Majesty would only make me a Commoner." As we are to have a Reform Bill for the admission of the oppressed classes to the full benefits of the Constitution, why not enfranchise the Peers? There is a precedent for it in the history of the Commonwealth, when certain Peers elected to the House of Commons were willingly admitted to take their seats. If Lord Clarendon, Lord de Grey, and Lord Dufferin could only be smuggled into the Lower House in the same way, there would be a better prospect of having the Queen's service properly conducted in Parliament next session.

Whether Ministers actually have a majority is a point upon which they are themselves probably in as great doubt as the rest of the world. Even during Lord Palmerston's lifetime there seemed to be grave errors in the ordinary calculation. For example, every Roman Catholic member without exception was ranked as a Liberal. Now there are not very many Roman Catholics who heartily accept that description of their politics, and the number is decidedly diminishing. Even of the class who have been known as steady Liberals for the last forty years, there were very few indeed who could be counted on by Mr. Brand as sure votes in any of the critical divisions of the last Parliament. In the next Parliament, which may not do anything except pass a Reform Bill, honourable members will probably act with the lively apprehension that anything like servile support to a Government of which Lord Russell is the head is likely to be very ill-regarded by Irish constituencies. It is within memory what a clean sweep was made of the members who had given offence in this way at the general election of 1852. But apart from the Irish members, the great question remains,—Is Lord Palmerston's majority a majority for Mr. Gladstone? That is a question full of nice doubt and curious cross-calculation, but in which, apparently, more depends upon Mr. Gladstone's own address and ability, and the general character of his policy in matters

for which he has never hitherto been responsible, than on any other consideration whatsoever.

Viewed in connection with Catholic and with Irish interests, which in Parliament are very nearly identical, there is no reason to be elated at the result of the election, or too sanguine of any considerable redress of grievances from the new House. The extraordinary poverty of political intellect in Ireland, which the elections of 1859 and 1857 revealed, as in contrast with the able group of Catholic public men who first entered the House of Commons in 1852, was in some degree relieved during the last Parliament by the unexampled success of Mr. Pope Hennessy. Ireland has not produced among the generation born since Catholic Emancipation a man of whom Parliament was in the same degree the natural sphere, and it is to be hoped that his absence from the House may be very brief. The defeat of Mr. MacMahon in Wexford, one of the most hard-working and zealous of the Independent party, is not to the credit of that county. The Irish, above all people in the world, cannot afford to have their political affairs turned into a Dunciad. A Dunciad at one end is sure to produce a Feniad at the other. Among the new members of Parliament, however, are several who are well-fitted to command the attention of the House; and the general *personnel* of the Irish representation has been decidedly improved by process of omission. Without touching on political considerations, it is, for example, a public benefit that the representation of the city of Dublin has passed out of the keeping of the wretched rump of the old Orange ascendancy, by whom Sir Edward Grogan and Mr. Vance were selected. In the new member for Youghal, Mr. M'Kenna (whose sensible and telling pamphlet on Irish politics we reviewed last April), the House of Commons will, after a little time, recognise a man of the kind whom it rather likes to honour—a man who has achieved a brilliant success in the organization and management of the higher class of commercial affairs, and who has at the same time a strong and consistent character, and a keen taste and decided aptitude for politics. We are glad to notice even one such considerable adhesion to the very small independent party, in whose gradual reinforcement we confess we see the sole way to an effectual representation of Irish and Catholic interests in the House of Commons. It is to be regretted on that account, in our opinion, that Mr. Dillon, of whose capacity and character we have already expressed a high opinion, should have committed himself by his concurrence in the resolutions passed at a meeting of Irish members held in Dublin to a political alliance with the extreme Liberal party,



in which as yet "the reciprocity is all on one side." This is bad politics, and worse policy; and the whole proceedings have in consequence the aspect, on the part of some of the honourable gentlemen who attended and who were not before regarded as pledged Liberals, of a sort of "platform" set up for the purpose of getting ready to go wrong on the first safe opportunity. If there be fault in this, the fault lies most distinctly with Mr. Dillon, who has been the organ of the National Association in a series of explanations on the subject of its policy of independent opposition, which certainly will not read well in context with the recent resolutions. Among the other newly-elected, Sir John Gray, who will, we suppose, give a general support to the Government, has remarkable political abilities, which have hitherto only improved in force and breadth with a quarter of a century's exercise in Irish public business. Sir Rowland Blennerhassett has hardly yet lost the air of College life, but has the talent to win for him the attention of even so fastidious an assembly as the House of Commons, if his own modesty do not bar his way. And then comes Mr. Michael Morris, whom, being accidentally out of office at present, we may regard in the character of master of the ceremonies, ushering in a blushing silk-gowned bevy of the Bar. There is the Attorney-General, and the Solicitor-General, and the Law Adviser to the Castle, and the First Serjeant and the Second Serjeant. There is not a lawyer connected with the Government who has not somehow or other contrived to scramble into Parliament. It is possible that Mr. Gladstone, finding that in this way, at all events, the Treasury Bench may be crammed full, will, nevertheless, occasionally wish, in the course of next session, that he could exchange the whole squad, and bring back again to the House the persuasive and full-flowing eloquence, and the upright, yet fascinating, character of the late Attorney-General, Mr. O'Hagan.

There is one point, however, in the resolutions passed at Dublin, which commands our good-will, and that is the expressed determination of the members assembled to make the Land Question their first object of policy. The negotiations into which the Irish hierarchy have entered with the Government on the question of Education, are evidently not yet ripe for parliamentary management. The mass of the population, though doubtless sensitive to the political indignity involved in the maintenance of the Established Church, do not seem to feel that any legislation touching its position is likely to be a direct relief to them. English opinion is moreover rapidly coming, if it has not already come to the conclusion,

that the reason why Fenianism takes its origin in America, is because a large proportion of the population of Ireland has in its wrath and bitterness taken refuge there from the Irish landlords, and from the Government which permitted the Irish landlords first to stimulate the over-population, and then to undertake the depopulation of the country—and that the reason why Fenianism spreads, and is unfortunately too likely to continue to spread, in Ireland, is because Ireland is occupied by a people who have got a ruling passion for land, and who, indeed, have no other way of living in their own country; but to whom, nevertheless, the institutions of the empire deny the power to acquire a permanent habitation and a stake in the soil. In the last number of this REVIEW, we pointed out the absolute concurrence of testimony, taken from witnesses of all classes, to the fact that all agricultural improvements in Ireland, are, and have been from immemorial time, made by the tenantry; and that it is idle to hope that such improvements will for the future be made by the landlords. Is it not a political absurdity, not to say a barbarous injustice, that in a country so circumstanced, the maxim of law, that “whatever is attached to the soil belongs to the soil,” should enable the proprietors to live in a state of chronic fraud against the farmer’s industry? Are the consequences to be wondered at? As the *Spectator* lately most justly observed in an article on the trial of one of the most remarkable of the Fenian prisoners—

We ask any decent Englishman who has carefully read Mr. Luby’s speech, whether that is the sort of character which could not live under constitutional laws; whether that same man, born and bred in England, would not have been a valuable citizen; whether in the United States he might not have been as loyal as Sheridan, or in Canada as D’Arcy M’Gee? Then why not in Ireland? Simply because the English Liberals, who day by day harmonize English legislation to the wants of English life, who have so ruled Scotland that for a hundred and twenty years not a cry has been raised, not a shot fired, not a speech made against the Union, refuse, or rather neglect, to bring Irish legislation into accord with Irish wants. *Ireland*, say thinking Englishmen, *everywhere wants the French system of law*. Grant it, and why should she not have it as well as Scotland the Roman? Whatever the want of Scotland, she turns to the Imperial Parliament for its gratification: whatever the need of Ireland, she looks towards agitation. Is that altogether Ireland’s fault?

This of course especially applies to the position of the agricultural classes under the French code. But even according to the English theory of society, which behind the letter of the law may be taken to rest on those accepted doctrines

of political economy to which all modern legislation is gradually conforming, the position of the Irish landlord is indefensible. As Mr. Mill says, "Wherever in any country the proprietor, generally speaking, ceases to be the improver, political economy has nothing to say in defence of landed property as there established \* \* \* and the time has come for making some new arrangement of the matter." Now, unfortunately, the case never was otherwise in Ireland. We are glad to believe that Mr. Mill will give the weight of his eminent authority to the advocacy of this cause in Parliament; and that he will not be alone in so doing. Another political economist of growing reputation, also a Member of Parliament, Mr. Fawcett, the Professor of Political Economy to the University of Cambridge, has, within the last few months, published a volume on "The Economic Position of the British Labourer," in the course of which he speaks with such strong sympathy of the injustice under which tenant-farmers suffer through the existing law, of the equitable character of the demand for tenant-right in Ireland, and of the danger of that country becoming completely depopulated under the present system, that we may be confident he will feel it his duty to aid in the carriage of any adequate measure of relief to this oppressed interest. So many circumstances, indeed, at present combine to insure a favourable reception for its large and generous treatment, that we particularly regret the undertaking of the members assembled in Dublin to introduce a Bill which we fear will be framed merely in the form of amendment on Mr. Cardwell's utterly useless, and, in so far, worse than mischievous Act. The Irish members are bound by every consideration of policy and of public spirit to treat that Act as, what it has proved, an utter nullity; and to insist, on the immediate test of confidence or opposition put without a day's delay, that the Government shall proceed to legislate upon the whole question in a manner really calculated to satisfy the interests involved, and to establish some harmony between the 200 Acts of Parliament passed to strengthen the landlord's legal *status* and the correct doctrines of political economy as to his position in relation to the State. In this matter we fear the Irish members will receive little aid from the extreme Liberal party—if by that name they mean Mr. Bright and his immediate followers. So long ago as the year 1849 Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, at a special meeting held in the Free Trade Hall in Manchester, volunteered magnificent promises to the people of Ireland, and great hopes were entertained for a time of what might be done through an alliance with the Manchester party; but

gradually their high humanity melted down into a series of prelections on the evils of primogeniture.

One whose foresight is far ahead, and in whose words is wisdom, lately said of our relation with the two great parties,—"It does not matter which ; they are equally doomed to do us justice." But this depends also on our integral independence of both. When Lord Derby said, "the Catholics are the natural allies of the Conservatives," he uttered a great political truth in a rather fragmentary form. It would be absurd by antithesis for Lord Russell to say "the Catholics are the natural allies of the Liberals." Modern liberalism, it would be instantly answered, lies under the ban of an Encyclical, and the great Liberal party is not merely a British party, but claims a *solidarité* as wide as the Church itself, and always in hostility to the ruling spirit of the Church—always, in fact, proclaiming, "The Pope is, by an over-ruling providential dispensation, invariably infallibly wrong." It is not possible for good Catholics to be the natural allies of the Liberal party, for its principles are the utter negation of our principles ; nor, however great the conformity of our leading political principles with those of the Conservative party, can any alliance between them and Catholics be other than one of strict covenant. Our hope, though it be faint,—our road, though it be narrow, still lies in the formation of a party absolutely independent of both.

---

# ART. VIII.—DR. PUSEY'S APOLOGY FOR ANGLICANISM.

*The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England.* A Letter to Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. London: Longmans.

*The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost; or, Reason and Revelation.* By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. London: Longmans.

*The Church of England a Portion of Christ's one Holy Catholic Church.* By Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. London: J. H. and J. Parker.\*

MANY of our readers are probably acquainted with Washington Irving's curious American story of "Rip Van Winkle," who slept for twenty years, and woke believing himself to have had but one good night's rest. Over night (as it were) he had left his fellow-townsmen loyal subjects to King George, and hearty lovers of the mother country; in the morning he found them burning with zeal for General Washington, and hating England with a bitter hatred. We are left, in great degree, to imagine their amazement and amusement, at Rip's old-fashioned associations and old-world ideas.

We hope Dr. Pusey will not think us unkind or disrespectful, if we say frankly how much his volume has reminded us of

---

\* We should say at starting, that the whole of this article was in type, before the appearance of Dr. Pusey's remarkable letters to the *Weekly Register* of Nov. 25 and Dec. 9. We have thought better, however, to leave it just as it originally stood, so that it may represent the impression which the volume itself made on our mind. Those letters undoubtedly show a far more kindly feeling towards Catholics, than is exhibited in the so-called "Irenicon;" and the former of them, we think, is in more than one way honourable to the writer. Still, however, Dr. Pusey displays as profound an unconsciousness as ever, on the fundamental and violent opposition between his own ecclesiastical principles and those of Rome. Still he remains a victim to the strange delusion that with his present opinions he can accept the formal decrees of the Roman Church. Still he fancies that Rome can possibly admit to her communion one who regards any portion of her practical teaching as opposed to Apostolic Doctrine, even though he were able to accept her formal decrees in some sense of his own. In our present article we have directly replied to him only on two points, viz, the Rule of Faith and the Church's indivisible unity. But we consider ourselves to have established premisses from which we shall be able, in April, to argue against him very conclusively on both those other particulars. In that future article we will give Dr. Pusey's various letters the attention which they deserve.

Rip Van Winkle. Take one instance of what we mean. He speaks throughout of F. Newman with a warmth and tenderness of feeling, which is honourable in the highest degree to both. He can be no ordinary man, who has inspired so deep an affection; nor can he be an ordinary man, who has retained it amidst so many differences and so complete a separation. Moreover, curiously enough, it is as nearly as possible this very period of twenty years which has elapsed, between F. Newman's conversion and the publication of this book. However little Dr. Pusey may have cared to inquire about the other converts, at least one would suppose that he must have watched the career of his dear and old friend with the steadiest and most unflagging interest. That that friend's arguments in favour of Rome have not convinced him, is evident, of course, from his remaining an Anglican; but every one would at least have expected that he must have studied them carefully, and must now show a complete familiarity with their scope and bearing. Yet we cannot discover the slightest trace of their even having entered his mind,—of his having so much as faintly apprehended them. If, like Rip Van Winkle, he had gone to sleep before the "Essay on Development" appeared, and had only just waked up again to write this volume, there could not have been a more complete unconsciousness of what Roman Catholics\* have to say in their own behalf. In more than one, indeed, of his earlier works (we mean those written before the twenty years' sleep) we find much more cordial appreciation of the sanctity produced by the Roman Catholic system than he has here displayed. On the other hand, in none of them has he evinced more conspicuously that simple contentment and satisfaction with the temper of his own communion, which, taken in connection with his patristic studies and sympathies, is surely among the most astounding and bewildering phenomena ever presented to the world. All we can say in a different direction is, that the bitter declamation against "Popish corruptions," which disfigured so many of his earlier works, finds no place, or at least no prominent place, in this. In every other respect he is almost stationary. Theological phenomena have changed during the last twenty years, in a degree which makes retrospect quite startling. Dr. Pusey himself has been brought into active and successful controversy with

---

\* Throughout our present article we will use this phrase, and not merely "Catholics," that we may not seem, in arguing against Dr. Pusey, to beg the question at issue by our very terms.



the new school of misbelievers; and we have had sincere pleasure, on more than one occasion, in expressing our warm gratitude for his services to that portion of truth, which he holds in common with ourselves. But his attitude towards Rome is as nearly as possible what it was. He tells us (pp. 3, 4) that he intends in future to abandon anti-Roman controversy, and confine himself to Scripture exposition. It is one satisfaction, that he will not again essay what he does so ill; it is another, that he will devote himself energetically to what he executes so well.

It is a curious proof indeed how wonderfully Dr. Pusey misunderstands Roman doctrine, that having written as aggressive a work as any Tractarian could possibly write, he calls it (and no doubt thinks it) an "Irenicon." In our next number we hope to consider more particularly his strange hallucinations about corporate reunion; but it will be necessary first to point out how fundamental and violent is the opposition between his principles and those of the Roman Church. This, then, will be the main purpose of our present article.

It has been observed by De Maistre as noteworthy, that so many writers, who have warred against infidelity with signal power and success, when turning their weapons against Rome, have been suddenly smitten both with feebleness of arm and unskilfulness of aim. We have never seen a more singular instance of this than the work before us. Its execution, indeed, is so curiously negligent and careless, that before entering on our general argument, it seems really important to place before our readers a few instances of what we mean.

In p. 307 the author thus quotes part of Pope S. Celestine's address to the Council of Ephesus. Let it be carefully observed that the italics are his, and not our's:—

The charge of teaching has descended [from the Apostles] *equally* upon all bishops. We are all engaged in it *by an hereditary right*: all we, who have come in their (the Apostles') stead, preach the name of our Lord to all the countries of the world, according to what was said to them, "Go ye, and teach all nations." You are to observe, my brethren, that the order we have received is a general order, and that He intended that we should all execute it, when He charged them with it, as a duty devolving *equally* upon all. We ought all to enter into the labours of those *whom we have all succeeded in dignity*.

It is difficult to understand why he has put these last words into italics. He must, of course, be well aware that, according to Roman doctrine, S. Peter possessed a divinely-given supremacy over the other Apostles. What then, though S. Celestine did recognize the bishops as successors of the

Apostles? How can it possibly be inferred from such a recognition, that he did not claim, as successor of S. Peter, a divinely-given supremacy over the whole episcopal body?

It is the earlier portion, however, of the extract with which we are chiefly concerned. Here Dr. Pusey has twice put the word "equally" into italics, as showing that he wishes to build on that word an important argument. Now, taking the passage as it stands, how does it militate against Papal supremacy? "The duty of teaching all nations devolves equally on us all." So the captain of a ship might well say to his crew, "The duty of navigating the ship devolves equally on us all; on you in your sphere, no less than on me in mine: to labour for that end is no less your duty than it is mine."

But it is a singular fact, that the word "equally," on which our author lays so much stress, does not occur in the original at all. It is "in commune," *"εἰς τὸ κοινόν."* The word "equally," as we have seen, need not imply equality of jurisdiction; but the words "in commune" cannot be so interpreted as to express such equality. The author has avowedly derived his translation from Fleury, who so rendered it, doubtless, for his own Gallican purposes; but surely so learned a theologian as Dr. Pusey should not content himself with a second-hand reference.

Further, Dr. Pusey has given no hint of the words with which this very address concludes:—

In our solicitude we have directed our holy brothers and fellow priests, men *most approved by us* and of one mind with us, Arcadius and Projectus bishops, and Philip *our priest*, to be present at your deliberations, and to carry out *what has already been determined by us*. To all which we doubt not, venerable brethren, that you will yield your consent, since, as it seems to us, what we have decreed is for the safety of the universal Church.

Whereas, then, the earlier part of the address cannot possibly be taken to imply the equality of Pope and bishops, the words just quoted do necessarily imply a denial of such equality.

Lastly, F. Harper, S.J., has lately written a most serviceable pamphlet, to which we drew attention last July (pp. 264—5). In this he translates various documents relating to the Council of Ephesus, which establish most incontrovertibly both the Pope's claim of supremacy, and the universal acceptance of that claim. Specimens of S. Celestine's language will be seen in our notice.

We will next point out various instances, in which Dr. Pusey has managed most wondrously to ignore the existing state of controversy. Thus, he refers (p. 35) to the alleged fall of Liberius, as though it were a notorious and admitted fact. Yet

many most learned theologians—we may cite Zaccaria and Palma as prominent instances—totally deny it; supporting their opinion by arguments, which every candid inquirer must admit to be extremely strong. We do not, of course, complain, that these arguments have not convinced Dr. Pusey; but we do very earnestly complain, that the latter writes as though no such argument had ever been attempted.

"The Donatists," says our author (p. 65), "were not merely separated from the Catholic Church throughout the world, but denied its existence and claimed to be the whole Church." Now there is one special circumstance which, we should have thought, would have impressed deeply on Dr. Pusey's mind every circumstance connected with the Donatists. "I cannot forget," says F. Newman, addressing Cardinal Wiseman then a Vicar-Apostolic, "that when, in the year 1839, a doubt first crossed my mind of the tenableness of the theological theory on which Anglicanism is based, it was caused in no slight degree by the perusal of a controversial paper, attributed to your lordship, on the schism of the Donatists."\* This paper on the Donatists, then, had a most special claim on the author's attention. Further, in that paper the Cardinal stated, that a party of the Donatists, headed by Ticonius, expressly repudiated that tenet which Dr. Pusey attributes to the whole sect; and yet that these men also were none the less regarded as schismatical.† Here, again, our complaint is, not that our opponent thinks differently, but that he ignores the circumstance of any one having questioned his facts.

At that period, indeed, of the DUBLIN REVIEW's history, everything contained in it demanded the careful consideration of an Anglican. It was not, as it is now, a purely private and unofficial periodical; it was the recognized organ of Dr. Wiseman, while Dr. Wiseman was the acknowledged English leader of Roman Catholic controversy. Dr. Pusey, however, seems never to have looked at it. "S. Meletius," he says (p. 60), as though enouncing a fact which no one ever thought of denying, "out of communion with Rome presided at the Second General Council;" and so on. So far back as December, 1844, this whole case of S. Meletius was carefully considered in the DUBLIN REVIEW (pp. 464—5). The reviewer denied Dr. Pusey's present statement in every particular. He quoted S. Jerome as writing to the Pope, "Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus," the three rival claimants, "*profess to adhere to*

\* Dedication of "Discourses addressed to mixed Congregations."

† See "Essays on various Subjects." By Cardinal Wiseman. Vol. II., pp. 256-7.

thee." And he further said, that when S. Meletius presided over the Council of Constantinople, he was in the fullest communion with Rome. Let Dr. Pusey answer his opponents, and we will consider his answer; but let him not ignore them.

Again, he takes for granted (pp. 309—314) that in rejecting the title of "universal bishop," a Pope disclaims his divinely given supremacy over the episcopal body. This assumption was also directly and most forcibly opposed in the same article (pp. 472—475).

In like manner, he lays down (p. 64) as uncontroverted, that "the great Russian empire" was "converted to the faith by the preaching of monks and missionary bishops, since the separation of east and west." Reference was made to this question in the DUBLIN REVIEW for June, 1847 (p. 310); and a pamphlet, written by Mr. Renouf, was cited as having "conclusively refuted" the idea.

And Dr. Pusey assumes, as of course, that the Immaculate Conception is negatived by patristic testimony, without making the slightest allusion to Passaglia's most elaborate and learned assemblage of patristic citations on the opposite side.\*

Now the simple fact is, we are quite sure, that Dr. Pusey is not at all aware of these Roman Catholic answers. Thus, in his work on the "Real Presence" (p. 162), he entered into controversy with an old article of the DUBLIN REVIEW; and he said in a note, "I did not see this article till some seven years after it was published." So far well. But a writer who so persistently closes his eyes and ears to the opposite side, has surely no kind of right to engage in controversy.

We have next to complain, that the author has most seriously misapprehended our own meaning, on a matter of extreme importance, whereon we had expressed ourselves with most careful and unexceptionable distinctness. He represents us (p. 292) as having claimed infallibility to Papal statements, which "need not be \* \* \* \* in any way formal in their character." But in the very page which he cites (April, 1865, p. 448) we confined the claim to Papal declarations "intended for publication with the purpose of inculcating some doctrine on the whole Church as theologically certain, or of denouncing some tenet to the whole Church as theologically unsound." Moreover, in that passage, we expressly referred to an article in our previous number, as drawing out the thesis for which we contended; in which article (p. 51) we recited a long variety of

---

\* "De Immaculato Deiparæ semper Virginis conceptu. Caroli Passaglia commentarius.

Papal dicta on doctrine, for which we emphatically disclaimed infallibility. How is it possible that controversy can be satisfactorily conducted, where there is such reckless neglect of an opponent's most definite explanations? And in accordance with this most strange misapprehension, Dr. Pusey (pp. 305-316) adduces, as telling against our thesis, a number of propositions expressed by Popes, of which hardly one can be alleged, with the slightest plausibility, as *ex cathedrâ*. We will consider every one of these propositions in our future article on the Papal Supremacy and Infallibility: here we can but point generally to the singular unfairness of his reply.

We will now name one or two arguments adduced by him, which are so obviously fallacious, that we are unfeignedly surprised at their introduction. For instance, a Roman writer (p. 183, *note*) makes this most reasonable remark. "Going to Mary," he says in effect, "does not imply that Christians *may* not, if they please, go directly to Jesus; any more than going to Jesus implies that they *may* not, if they please, go directly to the Father." On which Dr. Pusey remarks, "*It is not God, but man, who says, 'No man cometh unto Jesus, but by Mary.'*" We ask, what right has he to *assume* that the teaching of the Roman Church on this matter (whatever such teaching may precisely be,—for this is beside the question) is not the teaching of "God," but of "man"? If the Roman Catholic Church is infallible, whatever she really teaches is the very voice of God. Dr. Pusey is arguing that she cannot really be infallible, because she teaches erroneous doctrine concerning Mary. We ask him how he *proves* that her doctrine concerning Mary is erroneous; and he replies, because she is not infallible.

In p. 274, he says that his co-religionists may be quite certain of receiving Christ's Body and Blood, and that, too, with spiritual fruit, because "God would not allow His own to be deluded in such a matter as this." Now there is an incalculably long series of saints, who have declared, as a matter of their own experience, that they have derived inappreciable blessings from their constant invocation of Mary. Would God "suffer His own to be deluded on such a matter as this?"—on a matter which, according to Dr. Pusey, has led to consequences so unspeakably serious? If not, what possible right has our author, on his own principles, to impugn their testimony?

In p. 63, he takes for granted that to regard the Photians as external to the visible Church, is to represent "the whole guilt of this miserable rent" as having "fallen upon one side only." "Are we to assume," he proceeds, "whatever were

the original wrong tempers of two Greek patriarchs, that their sin either *then involved the innocent*, or now lives on so fatally after so many centuries?" Of what can our author have been thinking? Does he mean that no man is ever placed under most serious spiritual disadvantage, without his own *fault*? Is it an infant's *fault* that he dies unbaptized? Is it a child's *fault* that his parents are wicked? Is it a heathen's *fault* that he has never heard of the Gospel? Yet are not all these things most serious spiritual calamities?

"One recently returned from Rome had the impression that some of the extreme Ultramontanes, if they do not say so in so many words, imply a quasi-hypostatic union of the Holy Ghost with each successive Pope. The accurate writer who reported this to me, observed in answer, 'this seems to me Llamaism'" (p. 327 and *note*). We suppose Dr. Pusey will admit, that no Ultramontane ascribes to the Holy Father so special an influence from the Holy Ghost, as he (Dr. Pusey) ascribes to the Apostles. Does he hold, then, "a quasi-hypostatic union of the Holy Ghost" with each several Apostle? Is belief in Apostolic inspiration decently denominated Llamaism? We deeply regret this inadvertence.

Lastly, there is one feature in the volume, which to us is of all the most repulsive. What relation was ever more intimate than that between Jesus and Mary? It is surely impossible, in all ordinary cases, that men can love their Saviour, without feeling a tender and affectionate devotion for His Mother.\* Now, Dr. Pusey has felt it is duty to warn Englishmen against what he considers a dangerous excess of this devotion. But at least such a task must have been, one would think, exquisitely painful; whereas we must say, that if Dr. Pusey has felt any pain in it whatever, he has succeeded in heroically suppressing every indication of it. That excess of Marian devotion to which he objects, is certainly not the common fault of Englishmen. We wish to God we could see in Dr. Pusey's book any desire whatever that they should love her better! We wish we could see in it any sign that he himself loves her at all! The one aspect in which, throughout his dreary pages, he represents his Saviour's dearest Mother, is as the object of an antichristian worship, and as the most formidable antagonist to her Son's due honour. This is a characteristic of the work, which fills us with anxiety and alarm.

We might proceed much further with such criticisms: but we have said enough to vindicate the statement, for which these criticisms have been introduced; and we will proceed, without



further delay, to our general argument. Archbishop Manning's pamphlet was not controversial in the ordinary sense of that term. It was not directed to prove against Anglicans the truth of Roman Catholicism; but it purported to show, that no Roman Catholic could reasonably regard Dr. Pusey's communion, as "the great bulwark against infidelity in this land."\* Dr. Pusey, however, in his reply, addresses himself far more prominently to the ordinary controversial issue; for his chief enterprise is to maintain that the Church in communion with Rome does not exclusively constitute the Catholic Church, but that the Anglican Society is part thereof. This, therefore, is the thesis on which we shall chiefly encounter him; though we shall not omit to say so much on the Archbishop's original pamphlet, as to show the singular and almost incredible feebleness of the replies which our author has put forth. This is all which we can hope to accomplish in the present article; but more than one most important matter will remain—over and above Dr. Pusey's odd projects of ecclesiastical union—concerning which, in future numbers, we shall have most earnestly to join issue with the volume.

There is one advantage in having to contend against Dr. Pusey, rather than against one of the rationalistic school. The ground, common to him and ourselves, on which the argument may proceed, is very far wider and firmer than in the other case; and, consequently, there is far more hope of exhibiting an intelligible issue. In fact, our present opponent will be at one with us on the following most pregnant and momentous propositions:—

1. The possession of true doctrine is among the greatest blessings which any man can enjoy.
2. The only sure way to enjoy this blessing, is faithfully to accept that Rule of Faith which Christ has appointed.
3. Those who depart by a hair's breadth from that Rule, incur imminent peril of serious error.
4. Those who depart from it altogether and substitute some

---

\* It has been frequently thought that F. Newman expressed this opinion in the "Apologia;" but he has written to the *Weekly Register* (of Nov. 25) in explanation. What he had said was, "Doubtless the National Church has hitherto been a serviceable breakwater against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own." And he now thus comments on his own language:—"The words 'serviceable' and 'breakwater' both convey the idea of something accidental and *de facto*; whereas a bulwark is an essential part of the thing defended. Moreover, in saying 'against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own,' I imply that while it happens to serve Catholic truth in one respect, nevertheless in another it has doctrinal errors, and those fundamental." This explanation fairly removes from Dr. Newman's words the sense which had been attached to them by some readers.

other, have great reason to fear that they may accept many portentous errors as Christian truth, and reject much Christian truth as being portentous error.

5. Those, therefore, who publicly and systematically advocate a Rule of Faith totally different from that which God has appointed, however praiseworthy their intentions may be, are really labouring to inflict an unspeakable calamity on their fellow-Christians.

This last and no less (we grieve to say) is the charge which we must prefer against Dr. Pusey: that he has adopted a Rule of Faith totally different from the Rule appointed by Christ, and that he "teaches men so;" consequently, that his influence tends to inflict an unspeakable calamity on those who may come within its sphere. Our argument can contain nothing, which has not been said again and again by Roman Catholics; for Dr. Pusey has not added one single novelty to the whole controversy. We can only exhibit in our own way the general argument on which Roman Catholics insist.

They all agree, of course, in holding most firmly, that the one Rule of Faith appointed by Christ is the Voice of the Living Church.\* According to this principle, every Christian who desires to accept the Faith taught by his Redeemer in its absolute purity, has one simple means given him of effecting his object; viz., listening like a little child to the Church's authoritative instruction, as delivered to him through her authorised organs and instruments.

But as this principle is universal among Roman Catholics, so also it is peculiar to them; it is embraced by no other religionists whomsoever. We need not, in our present controversy, consider the frightfully large and increasing class of open rationalists; apart from these, however, two principal theories, contradictory of the Roman, are presented to our notice. Many hold that the Divine Rule of Faith is private judgment exercised on the text of Scripture; but as Dr. Pusey is at one with us in peremptorily rejecting this theory (see pp. 37-39), we have no need here either to explain it more fully or to enter on its refutation.† Others consider the whole Faith to have been given from the

\* Our argument concerns the "*Regula Proxima*," not the "*Regula Remota*." See Murray, de *Ecclesiâ*, vol. ii., p. 448.

† The author maintains indeed, that the whole Faith is *contained* in Holy Scripture: an opinion with which no Roman Catholic can concur. See Murray, de *Ecclesiâ*, vol. ii., p. 449. Still the question is of altogether minor importance, as compared with the issue on which we are engaged; and we have no space to dwell on it.

first, independently from the Church no less than of Scripture ; in such sense, that learned and intelligent men may obtain a more accurate and precise knowledge of it by studying ecclesiastical history, than by submitting humbly and unreservedly to the Church's guidance. This, we need hardly say, was F. Newman's view, when an Anglican ; and he has expressed it in the following passage with characteristic vigour and clearness.

The received notion in the English schools seems to be, that the faith which the Apostles delivered has ever existed in the Church whole and entire, *ever recognised as the faith, ascertainable as such*, and separable (to speak generally) from the mass of opinions which with it have obtained among Christians. It is considered *definite in its outline*, though its details admit of more or less perfection : and in consequence it is the property of each individual, so that he may battle for it in his day whoever attacks it : nay, *as not receiving it simply from the Church*, but through other sources besides historical and scriptural, he may defend it, if needs be, *against the Church, should the Church depart from it* : the faith being the foundation of the Church as well as of the individual, and *the individual being bound to obey the Church only so far as the Church holds to it*. This is the doctrine of fundamentals, and its peculiarity lies in this ; that it supposes the truth to be *entirely objective and detached*, not lying hid in the bosom of the Church, *clinging to her and as it were lost in her embrace*, but as being sole and unapproachable as on the Cross, or at the Resurrection, with the Church close by, but in the back ground. (*British Critic* for Oct., 1838, p. 367.)

This tenet in its general shape must be held by Dr. Pusey, as by every Tractarian ; because, on his view, the very thing which the Reformers did, and which he praises them for doing, was, to defend "purity of faith" against the existing Church, by appeals to Christian Antiquity. "Against the existing Church : " this is the point to be observed. No men deal more habitually and earnestly in the study of Christian Antiquity, than do Roman Catholics. When a new heresy arises, even before the Church has spoken, it is often refuted by that Tradition which now lives in the Church, and which may be traced to Apostolic times. Nay, in regard to dogma established and defined, Roman Catholics love to follow in their mind its historical progress through every age. But what all Roman Catholics maintain, and what all other religionists deny, is, that the living Church, on all those matters to which her teaching extends, is the only ultimate and unimpeachable voucher of genuine Apostolical Tradition.

The whole question, between Roman Catholics and Dr. Pusey, has for its basis this one issue, the Divine Rule of Faith. To what arbitration will Dr. Pusey refer that issue ? He will reply, no doubt, to Scripture and Antiquity. For ourselves,

we desire nothing better; and we will at once open our pleadings by a reference to the New Testament.

Before the Christian epoch (apart from Judaism), there was no authoritative standard of religion or morality. If any wished to live on higher than worldly motives, no assemblage of doctrines and principles offered itself for their acceptance, purporting to be *the* one truth; no distinct authoritative voice was heard, but only the clamorous vociferations, whether of the people at large, or of rival philosophers. One man accordingly made mere popular opinion his standard of right; another this or that sect; another looked doubtfully about from one to the other; the great majority, even of those who might have conceived momentary aspirations for what was higher and nobler, would be driven back to the mire of merely selfish objects and interests, by the apparent impossibility of obtaining any certain knowledge of moral and spiritual truth. To the great mass it would never even occur, to seek for aught higher and truer than what they found ready at hand; and any combined action of the comparatively higher and nobler spirits on their mind, was rendered impossible, by the incurable divergencies of opinion among the former, and their mutual contests. Nay, as regarded the moral advancement of the better class itself, let it be remembered that no external testimony was borne to that one moral system, which is the correlative to human nature in its entirety, and which alone is able to elicit its highest and choicest qualities. The absence, therefore, of all testimony to this system, and the consequent parcelling out of moral truth into mere scraps and fragments, overthrew all possibility (speaking generally) of elevated and consistent virtue.

This was that deep and festering evil, incurable except by interposition from above, which the Gospel professed to remedy. It enforced distinctly and emphatically the one true ethical code. It did still more. It disclosed high spiritual truths concerning God and His dealings with man, of the most transporting and elevating character; truths which (as one may say) swallowed up morality into religion; stamped an eternal value on every little action of every day; and, moreover (where duly received), gave to the whole religious and moral character that harmony and proportion, for which man had before possessed the materials, but not the power; the external mould, but not the quickening, animating spirit. It abolished, so far as knowledge of truth is concerned, all essential distinction between the stronger and the weaker minds; between those who had leisure and faculties for speculative inquiries, and those who were immersed in the tumult of worldly affairs.

One fixed code of doctrine was securely offered to the busy; while the speculative had no further privilege, than that of analysing, systematising, and carrying forward to its results, this one code. The weaker minds were enabled to accept and know this; the stronger were obliged to bow down before it. It thus evoked a degree of moral and spiritual energy, so incommensurably greater than any which before existed, as to open quite a new idea of the capacities of human nature. Nor was this the whole or the chief of its results. It further enabled that energy to act directly, and without drawback, for the benefit of mankind, by furnishing a common ground for union and sympathy. In saying all which, we must not, of course, be supposed to forget (what, however, is not to our immediate purpose) the special gifts of grace which the Church imparts.

Now it is perhaps conceivable that the truths, so offered, might have been imparted by some Rule of Faith other than the Roman. It is, perhaps, conceivable that Sacred Writings should have been given into the hands of each convert, in order that he might construct his own religion from their perusal; or that some sacred form of words should be given to each, as precisely containing the essentials and fundamentals of true doctrine. It is, perhaps, conceivable; but the fact plainly and indubitably was otherwise. We say it is *perhaps* conceivable; for to our mind the possibility of success on any other method, regard being had to the laws of human nature, is more than doubtful. The first Christians had, in a vast number of instances, been converts from nothing less than heathenism, and that at a time when it wore one of its most corrupt and degrading forms; from which dense and stifling darkness, with eyes clouded and enfeebled, they were brought directly within the influence of the purest light which ever visited this world. Then consider, still more emphatically, how vast an extent of ground is covered by the Christian Revelation. It includes at one side mysteries wholly alien to all experience or past conception, of the most startling (and one may say) bewildering character; and also exposed to an indefinite number of heretical corruptions, in exact proportion to the inexhaustible variety of aspects presented by them to the human mind. It includes, at the other side, a most definite moral code, which must bring it into conflict with every sect of philosophy, past, present, and future. Surely, all this being duly pondered, we may well doubt whether it was even possible (except by palpable miracle) that these supernatural objects and principles *could* be even rightly apprehended by the first Christians; far less could obtain

any real hold on them; and far less still, could become the leading principle of their lives; unless some immeasurably more potent means had been employed, than such merely mechanical contrivances as those above mentioned. It was by incorporating Christians, then, into a living Society, that this great object was effected; by bringing them and retaining them in direct contact with those, who had learned the truth by special inspiration.

We all know the subtle, but most efficacious, influences, communicated through the various waves (as it were) of some organised society. We know in how inexplicable, and yet undeniable a degree, feelings and prepossessions, which are acted on as first principles, and which are ordinarily unassailable by argument, are implanted by the various associations, habits, usages—in one word, by the general *tone* of such a body; what a mysterious sympathy spreads through the mass, and conveys into the very heart of each individual a share in the peculiar life and character of the whole. And we know, again, the astonishing power possessed by any person endued with extraordinary wisdom and genius, of spreading round himself, as it were, an atmosphere of his own; an atmosphere which gives to his direct lessons and admonitions a quite incomparably fuller meaning and deeper force, than they would otherwise possess. Both these powerful moral engines were united in the constitution of the Apostolic Church.

Nor is it at all out of compass to suppose (we mean, it is no more than might well follow under the circumstances), that by the help of such unspeakably efficacious instruments, the Apostles might have fully succeeded, before their death, in deeply imbuing their disciples with the Christian ideas; in enforcing on the mind of the Church as a whole, and of each individual in different degrees, all the lessons which Christ desired them to impart. Thus the Church as a whole might have received that one true impression of the great Objects of Faith, —the Sacred Trinity, and our Adorable Saviour,—which the whole series of Ecclesiastical Definitions, down to the “*Una Res*” of the 4th Lateran, and the Anti-adoptionism of the Council of Frankfort, most inadequately indeed represents, yet indicates and shadows forth. She might have obtained that deep perception of the Christian’s hidden life, and the dealings of God with the soul, which the various decrees on Original Sin, Justification, Grace, Merit, and the like, have partially put into doctrinal shape, and which ascetical writers have so copiously exhibited; but which is far indeed, as yet, from being intellectually exhausted. She might have acquired that accurate knowledge of true ethical principles, which admits of being



applied to successive complications of circumstances; and which has, in small part, been (as we maintain) authoritatively and infallibly so applied, in the various decisions of the Church on moral questions. She might have learned the high dignity of a Christian Saint; and might have received that apprehension of Mary's supereminent prerogatives and spotless purity, which has no legitimate analysis short of the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception. Nay, the Apostles might have deeply indoctrinated the Church's mind, not only with these great essentials, but with an indefinite number of practical habits, principles, and rules, which were handed down (as it were) unconsciously and in the mass to the next generation; which have become the traditionary maxims of the Church; and have been the means of leading her safely in many a conjuncture, and guiding her aright in many a perplexity. And all this, of course, over and above their direct and formal teaching, on the inspiration of Scripture, or the various matters of positive ordinance; the sacraments ordained by Christ; the power of the keys; the perpetuity of the Church; her divinely-appointed bond of union; and other such vitally essential particulars.

It is this which Roman Catholics in general believe the Apostles to have done, and which fully harmonizes at least with the sacred records. What the Scripture expressly states, however, most abundantly suffices for our argument. We ask, then, what is the broad Scriptural fact, as regards the Rule of Faith in Apostolic times?

Christians, contemporary with the Apostles, were formed into one visible and organized society, under the governance of those who were divinely inspired to teach them. The authoritative teaching, again, was not confined to new and supernatural matter; but was to the full as distinct and emphatic, in declaring explicitly to their understanding, and pressing urgently on their conscience, the principles of natural religion and morality. A Jew or Gentile, who desired salvation, was obliged to submit himself at once both to the instruction and to the government of the Divine missionaries. He might have been attracted to them by some one doctrine, or some one appointed usage: but in joining them, he laid himself under the obligation of humbly accepting he knew not what unknown body of other doctrines and usages; some (it may be) at first indefinitely repulsive and distasteful. The spread of the Gospel, again, was the propagation of this Apostolic Empire; the two proceeded *pari passu* together, or rather were one and the same thing, not separable even by the intellect. As a flock look to the shepherd for guidance, or children to a parent, and

never in their very dreams separate the idea of humbly learning from that of willingly obeying,—so was it with the first Christians. With them, to be within the Church, was salvation; to be without it, eternal ruin: and to be within the Church, implied in its very nature to be obedient to her laws and governance, and to be gradual recipients of her doctrine. As a good parent lays down those laws which best enable his children to understand his teaching, so the Apostles' principles of governance were in deepest harmony with their doctrinal lessons. The most powerful and original minds, again, were required to bow humbly before the very same doctrines, which were the strength and support of the weakest and most ordinary of the brethren. In a word, the one Rule of Faith in Apostolic times was the "*Ecclesiæ jure magisterium.*" The faithful dreamed not of any other method for imbibing religious truth, except *listening humbly to the Church's voice, as she taught through her various organs and representatives.*

We forbear from adducing Scriptural evidence in detail for our statement, because we are confident that Dr. Pusey will agree with the whole of it. His position will be (see p. 85) that at the Apostles' death all this was changed, and a new order of things introduced. In reply to which supposition we argue as follows.

The Apostles, Dr. Pusey will admit, had no end more nearly at heart, than the future preservation of Christian dogma in its fulness and purity. It is further evident that there could be no security for such preservation, no safeguard against that doctrinal corruption which they regarded as among the gravest of calamities, unless Christians were trained to hold firmly the Divine Rule of Faith. Now, Dr. Pusey thinks that at their death the Divine Rule of Faith was to be fundamentally changed; that the Church's "*jure magisterium*" was no longer to be the Catholic's final and conclusive standard of belief; but that appeal from it to some still higher authority was permitted and even counselled. Had this been really God's appointment, the Apostles must of course have been inspired accordingly. Had they been so inspired, it is most certain that, in their keen zeal for doctrinal purity, they would have inculcated this truth with earnestness and perseverance. No topic would have occupied a more prominent and more emphatic place in their teaching, than the Rule of Faith which was to be called into existence at their own death. They would have guarded, with most jealous care, against the danger, otherwise so inevitably imminent, of their disciples supposing that the existing Rule was to remain unchanged. On such a supposition, St. John—throughout

those many years during which he survived the other Apostles — would have been universally recognised as the Church's last infallible teacher; and his death would have been the most startling epoch in Christian history, since the great day of Pentecost had passed.

We do not see how Dr. Pusey or any one else can doubt that this is temperately and fairly argued. It is hardly necessary to add, how violently inconsistent are the actual facts with any such hypothesis. St. John's death, instead of being the most critical event in history, passes almost "*sub silentio*." The supreme teaching of inspired men was succeeded by that of uninspired, in a natural and easy succession; no trace, even the most distant, can be found of any new Rule of Faith; and the Church of the second century occupied, as of right, the very same position with the Church of the first. This argument alone must surely be considered as nothing less than conclusive.

We have said that no trace can be found in the later centuries of any new Rule of Faith. We are, of course, well aware that there is a long list of patristic passages, which have been quoted in favour of private judgment on the text of Scripture; but as Dr. Pusey agrees with us that the Protestant world has grossly misinterpreted these passages, they do not here concern us. Dr. Pusey holds, as we hold, that not Scripture only, but Tradition also, was employed by God as a means of handing onward the faith. And what we are here saying is that, as regards whether the sound doctrinal interpretation of Scripture or the true sense of Tradition, all Catholics, without exception, have consistently, from the first ages downwards, regarded the judgment of the living Church as the one final and irreversible standard of appeal. No hint of any other doctrine can be found in any one early Catholic writer. Reference was sometimes made by such writers to local churches generally; sometimes to the Apostolical churches in particular; and sometimes to the Holy See: but not one in their number dreamed of questioning the principle which we have just expressed.

Any one may say this with perfect confidence, however little his own detailed knowledge of the Fathers, when arguing with men so learned as Dr. Pusey and his friends; because we may be quite certain that if any opposite testimony had been discoverable, they would long since have produced it. Let us look back at the very first volume of the Tracts, written at a time when all the contributors, without exception, were most confident of their ground, and when Rome, indeed, was denounced in language of incredible severity. This volume contains a series of papers called "*Records of the Church*," constructed

with the view of placing before Anglican readers such extracts from Antiquity, as were judged most suitable for promoting true Anglican doctrine. We confidently affirm that there is not one syllable in these "Records" at variance with our statement; not one syllable which can even be alleged as giving the slightest countenance to Dr. Pusey's Rule of Faith: while there are several passages which distinctly enunciate our own. For instance. S. Ignatius, Martyr:—

*Study to be confirmed in the doctrine of the Lord and of the Apostles, . . . under your most excellent Bishop, and your presbytery and the deacons.*"—No. 2, p. 4.

*Avoid division and corrupt doctrines; but where your shepherd is, thither follow ye as sheep. For there be many wolves unworthy to be trusted, . . . but in your unity [i.e., the unity of the Church] they shall have no place.*"—No. 10, p. 1.

Mr. Waterworth, in his invaluable work on "The Faith of Catholics," adds another passage from Ignatius, which may be taken as illustrating these. It is from his epistle to the Tralians:—

*I exhort you, therefore, to abstain from the strange herb, which is heresy. . . . From such men keep yourself guarded; and guarded you will be, if ye are not puffed up and separated from Jesus Christ our Lord, and from the Bishop.*

Returning to the Tractarian "Records of the Church," we find the following most significant extract from S. Irenæus, who, as the editor reminds us, was the disciple of Polycarp, the friend of S. John.

This is the message, and this the faith, which the Church has received (as was said above); and which, though dispersed throughout the whole world, she *sedulously guards*, as though she dwelt but in one place; believes as uniformly as though she had but one soul and the same heart; and preaches, teaches, hands down to posterity, as harmoniously as though she had but one mouth. True it is, the world's languages are various, but the power of the Tradition is one and the same. There is no difference of Faith or Tradition, whether in the churches of Germany, or in Spain, or in Gaul, or in the East or in Egypt, or in Africa, or in the more central parts of the world: but as the Sun, God's creature, is one and the same in all the world, so also the preaching of the Truth shineth everywhere, and lighteth every one who will come to the knowledge of the Truth. Among the rulers of the Church, *neither he who is powerful in word speaks other doctrine* (for no one can be above his Master), *nor does the weak in the word diminish the Tradition.* For, whereas the Faith is one and the same, neither he who has much to say concerning it, hath anything over, nor he who speaketh little any lack.—Tracts, No. 14, p. 2.

This, again, we may serviceably supplement by other passages of St. Irenæus, from Mr. Waterworth's volume.

*We ought not to seek among others for the truth, which it is easy to receive from the Church ; seeing that the Apostles have brought together most fully into it, as into a rich repository, all whatever is of truth.*

They [the Apostles] sought that they [the Bishops] whom they left as successors, *delivering unto them their own office as teachers and governors (suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes)*, should be especially perfect, &c.

From the various similar passages given by Mr. Waterworth from other authors, for brevity's sake we will but extract one. It was written by S. Theophilus, in a work which Mr. Waterworth dates A.D. 182:—

*As in the sea there are inhabited and well-watered and fruitful islands with ports and harbours, that they that are tempest-tossed may find shelter in them ; so in the world, agitated and tossed by sins, God hath given holy churches in which, as in harbours, are the doctrines of the truth.*

We will again refer to the Tractarian "Records" for our final specimen, the well-known words of Tertullian :—

*If the Lord Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to preach, it follows that no other preachers are to be received, but those whom Christ appointed, because "no one knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son hath revealed Him." And it seems that the Son has revealed Him to no others than the Apostles, whom he sent to preach that doctrine, of course, which He revealed to them. But what they preached, that is, what Christ revealed to them, I shall here also plead should be proved in no other way than by means of those same Churches which the Apostles themselves founded, by preaching to them, as well as by word of mouth, as afterwards by Epistles. If these things are so, it follows immediately that all doctrine that agrees with those Apostolic Churches, the depositaries and sources of the faith, is to be reckoned for truth, preserving, as they doubtless do, what they received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God. But that every other doctrine is to be presumed false, that savours of contradiction to the truth of the Churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God.*

It only remains, then, to prove whether this our doctrine, the Rule of which we have given above, is to be considered of Apostolic Tradition ; and from this very fact, whether the rest come not of falsehood. *Now our very inter-communion with the Apostolical Churches, which is matter of fact, is an evidence that our doctrine does not differ from theirs.* This is the witness of the truth.

Such, then, was the patristic Rule of Faith from the first. No hint of any different doctrine have Dr. Pusey and his friends been able to discover ; no hint of any possibility (to repeat F. Newman's Anglican words) that "the Church may depart

from the Faith," or that the individual can, without grievous sin, "defend" what he considers to be "the Faith" against her.

One further inference may reasonably be drawn from such extracts as the foregoing, and from the large number of similar quotations which our controversialists adduce.

If the Apostolic "depositum" were separable, even in idea, from the living witness and practical teaching of the Church,—if it admitted of being fully communicated in a certain given number of propositions,—what possible meaning could we assign to such very strong expressions, as "the Church *sedulously* guards it;" "holds as having one soul and one heart;" "tempest-tossed men find shelter in holy Churches, in which, as in harbours, are the doctrines of the truth"? Let this given number of propositions be reduced to writing, or to memory, the Church's office of *guarding* is at an end. Once admit, on the other hand, such principles as those above stated, everything becomes intelligible and natural. The Church is put in trust with a treasure,—on the one hand, unspeakably precious; yet, on the other hand, of so delicate, supernatural, spiritual a quality, that it readily and imperceptibly admits of corruption, unless "*sedulously guarded*;" that it cannot be rightly received, except by those who are imbued with the very principles which it inculcates or presupposes, and who are therefore "of one soul and one heart;" that it cannot be communicated in words, but must be learned in some far more intimate and far-reaching way, by means of fleeing into the Churches commissioned to teach it, as "tempest-tossed men flee into harbours."

We need hardly say, that in each successive period of ecclesiastical history the patristic evidence on the Rule of Faith becomes even clearer and more irrefragable. There is no need, therefore, of pursuing the "Records of the Church" into the second volume of the Tracts, except as regards one particular treatise, of which parts are therein contained. We refer to the famous "commonitorium" of Vincentius Lirinensis. Anglicans have been fond of citing this treatise, as though it told in behalf of their argument; whereas, in truth, it is no less decisive against them than are those other patristic passages already adduced. By citing it so perseveringly, they proclaim that there is no other ancient testimony which they regard as so favourable to their cause; and if it be found, therefore, really to be dead against them, their cause is indeed desperate. The Rev. Mr. Penny, however, now of the Irish Catholic University, fully established this conclusion, in a work called "The Exercise of Faith Impossible, except in the



Catholic Church;”\* and we will here give a brief analysis of his argument. The references throughout are to the Oxford translation of Vincent:—

Mr. Penny begins by drawing attention to Vincent's most express words (p. 132), heresies are not “always, nor all, after this sort to be impugned, but only such as be *new and upstart*; to wit, at *their first springing up*.” And so, at starting, Vincent speaks of “finding out the fraud of heretics *daily springing up*” (p. 8). “Secondly,” asks Mr. Penny, “what does Vincent mean by Antiquity? We shall see this the more easily, by bearing in mind what term he opposes to it; this term is ‘novelty;’ and he has clearly explained what he means by ‘novelty,’ limiting it to ‘the first springing up of a heresy.’ Antiquity, therefore, in his acceptation, extends *up to the time when the novelty commences*—that is, when the new heresy starts up.” This is quite evident to any one who will read the treatise with even moderate candour and attention. Consider, *e. g.*, Vincent's choice of those Fathers, whose writings are to be our guide. He does not speak, according to the language of Tractarians, about “going back to those who lived nearest to Apostolic times;” such a notion is not to be found in the whole treatise. “Consult the opinions,” he says (p. 13), “of those Fathers only which, living at *divers times* and sundry places, yet *continuing in the communion and faith of one Catholic Church*, were approved masters and guides to be followed.” “Those Fathers' opinions only are to be conferred together, which, with holiness, wisdom, and constancy, lived, taught, and continued, in *the faith and communion of the Catholic Church*” (p. 133). You see, he is speaking all through of some *new* heresy, on which the Church has not yet spoken; he is giving tests whereby contemporaries might at once discover its real nature; and he assumes, as a first principle, that those who had lived “in the faith and communion of the Catholic Church,” were, of course, orthodox. He expresses the same thing still more distinctly, in the following comment on God's dealings with heretics (p. 93). “This is the reason why, when out of the safe port of the Catholic faith, they are shaken, tossed, and almost killed with storms and troubles,” viz., in order that they should give up their “novelties,” “and so retire, and *keep themselves within the most sure port of their calm and good mother*, . . . and drink of the flowing

---

\* Richardson, Derby, 1846. We cannot, however, entirely accept the doctrine which gives its name to the treatise. See DUBLIN REVIEW for last April, p. 460. The argument to which we refer in the text is from p. 93 to p. 102.

rivers of lively and pure water." Words cannot express more clearly the Church's office, as divinely guaranteed guardian of the Faith. Again, he distinctly recognises the duty, not merely of handing down the Faith, but of analysing it and viewing it in its mutual relations. "That which men before believed *obscurely*, let them by thy exposition understand *more clearly*. Let posterity rejoice for coming to the understanding of that by thy means, which Antiquity, *without* that understanding, had in veneration" (p. 101). And the often-quoted passage on development bears in the same direction; of which one or two short extracts will sufficiently remind our readers. "Fitting it is, that the understanding, knowledge, and wisdom . . . of the Church in general should, by the advance of ages, *abundantly increase and go forward*." . . . "Christian doctrine . . . with years must wax more sound, *with time become more ample*, yet remain incorrupt and entire." It is impossible, surely, for language to be further removed than this is, from giving the slightest sanction to the habit so favoured by Dr. Pusey and his school; to the habit of appealing against those doctrines which the later Church either formally or practically teaches, by a reference to the records of earlier times.

Indeed, so obviously is this truth impressed on every page of the treatise, that the editor of the "Tracts," although himself designating the "corruptions of the Roman Church" as "a most deplorable and astounding instance" of error, yet admits that Vincent "never anticipated such an occurrence" as the "admission of error in" *any* branches of the Church. Vincent, he says, "considers the Church to possess within it that principle of health and vigour, which *expels heresies out of its system*, without its suffering more than a temporary disarrangement from them."

Lastly, Dr. Pusey himself gives a testimony to the Roman doctrine, which is stronger from the very fact that it is so wholly undesigned. In a sermon on "The Rule of Faith," which he more than once quotes in his present volume, the following passage occurs. It will be seen that out of twenty-eight patristic phrases, which he cites as expressing "the body of Faith," no fewer than sixteen refer to the Church's office as its divinely guaranteed guardian. These we have put into italics—

This body of Faith is spoken of by different names, from the very earliest times, as a recognized whole, alike by St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and his Apologist St. Pamphilus or Eusebius, as by St. Irenæus and Tertullian. It is called "*the Faith of the Church*," "*the preaching of the Church*," "*the Truth of the Churches*," "*ecclesiastical teaching*," "*ecclesiastical*"

*Faith," "the first and ecclesiastical Tradition," "the doctrines of the Truth," "Ecclesiastical and Apostolical Tradition," "Apostolical and Ecclesiastical dogmas," "Ecclesiastical Rule," "the doctrine of the Apostles," "the Faith delivered by the Church, fenced by Holy Scripture," "the Rule of the heavenly Church of Christ according to the succession from the Apostles," "the celebrated and venerable Rule of Tradition," "the Tradition from the Apostles preserved in the Churches, through the succession of Presbyters; the unvarying Rule of Faith received through Baptism," "the Tradition of the Apostles," "the Apostolic Faith transmitted to us through the Fathers," "that excellent Deposit of the Holy Fathers, who were nearest to Christ and the primitive Faith," "the word of the Church," "the Faith of the Fathers," "the Apostolic Rule," "the doctrine heard in Holy Church," "the safe Rule," "the Rule of the Holy Church of God," "the Tradition and Rule of Truth," "the Faith of the Catholic Church," "the Rule of Truth" \*—(pp. 31, 32).*

Undoubtedly, then, if "Scripture and Antiquity" can render certain any doctrine in the world, they render certain the doctrine, that the Living Church is the Christian's one divinely-appointed guide to Apostolic Truth; and that she is ever privileged by God faithfully to guard and teach that truth throughout the *orbis terrarum*. How singular are Dr. Pusey's speculations, when viewed under this light! Take one instance. Assuredly the author will agree with us, that there is no more vital and essential portion of the Deposit, than true doctrine on the Church's divinely-given constitution. Now the Roman Catholic Church teaches that this divinely-given constitution prominently includes the Papal supremacy; and she defined that supremacy at the Council of Florence. We will not here inquire what Dr. Pusey considers the Apostolic teaching on this matter to have been; suffice it, that he regards the Roman doctrine as totally at variance with that teaching, and as inexpressibly injurious to God's interests. It is his opinion, therefore, that on a question most momentous, and most pregnant with awful consequences, the Roman Catholic Church obliges her children, on pain of anathema, to anathematize that truth which the Apostles taught. Further, as he most truly observes, "Since the Faith is one whole, then whosoever parteth with or altereth any portion of the one Faith, in fact changes the whole." (P. 54.) The Roman Catholic Church, consequently, having (in his view) "parted with or altered one portion of the one Faith"—namely, Christ's doctrine on the Church's constitution—has, in effect, "changed the whole." This, and no less, being his virtual charge against her, he considers her, nevertheless, to be an integral portion of that Divine Society, which has received from God a promise of

---

\* Published by Parker in 1851, pp. 31, 32.

securely guarding Apostolic Truth. Surely the force of unreason can no further go.

The doctrine which we have now investigated on the "Rule of Faith" includes, as part of itself, a correlative doctrine; that of the Church's infallibility. This is most manifest from the course of our previous remarks; and one only explanation need be added. The Church Catholic, by divine promise, sedulously and incorruptly guards the Faith both in her formal and in her practical teaching. This is the Christian principle, as it came down from the Apostolic period. When time advanced, and respite from persecution gave leisure for thought, one healthy and legitimate result of this circumstance was, that the Christian mind began far more actively to *reflect* on the various doctrines which it had embraced. As this process continued, there was a constantly increasing evidence that the Church could not succeed in preserving incorrupt the Faith committed to her charge, unless she herself employed much intellectual analysis; both in defining her doctrine, and in formulizing the heresies which she condemned. Later on there came a further experience. A number of secondary questions arose; propositions were advocated which, though not in themselves heretical, were yet so intimately connected with heresy that, unless effectually expelled from the Church, they would certainly introduce it. The gift, therefore, of preserving the faith incorrupt, was seen to include the prerogative of infallibility, not merely in condemning certain tenets as heretical, but in branding others with some minor theological censure.\* All this, we say, is but the exhibition under new circumstances of the one ancient divine gift.

From the two preceding correlative doctrines, may at once be inferred the Church's unity; by which word we mean to express, that she is subjected by God's Law to one supreme government. We are not here maintaining that such government is monarchical, though of course we so believe; but merely that the Church was established by God as one indivisible society under one central rule. Just as Great Britain and Ireland are unquestionably under one central rule, though that rule is not monarchical (for the supreme government is with Queen, Lords, and Commons)—so we are not necessarily maintaining that the Church is monarchically governed, when we maintain that she is united under one supreme authority. We should have called this characteristic by the

---

\* See DUBLIN REVIEW for July, 1864, pp. 82-84.

name of "organic" unity, had not Dr. Pusey used this word in a totally different sense (see p. 46). Under circumstances, we may be allowed to invent an expression, and designate this quality as "hierarchical unity."

We have said that this doctrine, of the Church's hierarchical unity, follows from the two doctrines already established. If any one, indeed, chooses to imagine that the Apostolic Church, instead of being one hierarchical society, consisted of twelve such societies, each governed by an Apostle—so strange a supposition would not, however, involve any detriment to her unity of Faith: because the Apostles, being severally inspired, would teach one and the same doctrine to their respective obediences. But so soon as the Apostles were removed, had the Church not been constituted by God as one hierarchical society, one of two results must have followed. Either the supreme government of each separate society must have received that gift of infallibility, which Roman Catholics ascribe to their *Ecclesia Docens*; or else unity of Faith must have been speedily at an end. But no one of any school whatever has even imagined the former alternative. It follows, therefore, that if unity of Faith were secured at all, it could only have been by God (1) having placed the whole Church under one supreme government, and (2) having invested that government with infallibility.

But there is no need of our deducing the doctrine of unity from any other; its independent evidence, both in Scripture and Antiquity, is overwhelming. First, for the Apostolic Church. Nothing can be more plain from the New Testament—and we are sure Dr. Pusey will not think of denying it—than that she was one hierarchical society governed by the Apostles. We are not here maintaining that she was governed by S. Peter. In so far as regards our present argument, Dr. Pusey may suppose, if he will, that the Apostles were specially overruled in each particular case to issue harmonious commands, just as they were inspired to teach harmonious doctrine. We are here but saying that the Apostolic Church was not composed of twelve (or more) hierarchical societies,—united, indeed, with each other in strictest amity,—but yet distinct societies. No; the Apostolic Church, as one whole, were placed under the government of the Apostles, as of one governing body. We will not pause to argue so plain a fact, because we are sure that Dr. Pusey holds it as strongly as we do.

Protestants in general, as we understand them, think that the Apostolic Empire ended with the Apostles' life. But Dr. Pusey is forward in maintaining that the Church Catholic

of every age is lineally descended from the Apostolic. Now, the Apostolic Church was by Divine appointment one hierarchical society; hence the Church Catholic of every age is by Divine appointment one hierarchical society. Our old argument here returns. Had it been part of God's revelation that after the Apostles' death the Church was no longer required by His Law to be such a society—that Christians were no longer under an obligation of submitting to one and the same central authority—there is no truth which the Apostles would have been more careful to teach, and which every Christian would have been more certain to learn. S. John, throughout those many years during which he survived the other Apostles, would have been universally regarded as the one sovereign of the still united Church; and at his death there would have been a solemn inauguration of the new constitution. No supposition, of course, can be in more violent antagonism with the most obvious facts; and the Roman conclusion is thus demonstrated as true.

So far, indeed, from its being the case that the Divine command of hierarchical unity was understood to cease with the Apostles, it was not till after their death that an appellation was assumed which pre-eminently implied it. The word "Catholic" is stated by the Anglican Bull to have been in universal use from the time of S. Polycarp; \* and the "One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church" was proclaimed by that Council of Constantinople, which Dr. Pusey admits to have been infallible. The word "Church," "Ecclesia," would surely be an extraordinary word, to express the federal coalition of independent hierarchical societies; "one" Ecclesia still more extraordinary; one "*Catholic*" Ecclesia the most extraordinary of all.

Then Dr. Pusey will of course hold, that the various appellations, given to the Church in Scripture, apply to her as existing in every age. But several of them on their very statement are seen to imply hierarchical unity. "The Church was to remain, from the Lord's first coming to His second, a kingdom, a fold, a family, a household, an army. . . What is that which makes a kingdom one? the derivation of all jurisdiction from its sovereign. Or an army one? the concentration of all authority in its general. Or a household one? but the rule of its master. Two sovereigns, two generals with supreme power, two masters, . . . destroy altogether the idea of those respective unities."†

---

\* "*Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*," c. 6, s. 14.

† Allies's "*See of St. Peter*," pp. 48-9.



Before proceeding further, it is necessary to understand clearly what is Dr. Pusey's own tenet on ecclesiastical unity. Most Anglican controversialists of the present day shrink sensitively from drawing out any theory of their own; but our author is honourably distinguished from them in this particular, and expresses his view in a sufficiently intelligible shape. For convenience' sake, we number the various "means and conditions of unity" which he lays down.

Thus, then, we have from Holy Scripture, as means and conditions of the unity of the Church, [1] One All-Perfect Author, the "One God and Father of all;" [2] one end to which all tends, the "one hope of our calling;" [3] "One Head," the Head of the Church, our "One Lord;" [4] "One Spirit," giving life to every living member; [5] the same Sacraments, "One Baptism," and "One Bread," by which we are all ingrafted into or maintained in the One Body of our One Head; [6] one Apostolic descent of the Bishops and Pastors of the flock, coming down from One; [7] "One" common "Faith," that which was given once for all, with the anathema that we hold no doctrine at variance with it, although an Angel from Heaven were to preach it. Of these we are receivers only.

*These if any wilfully reject, they reject Christ.* They sever themselves not only from the Body of Christ, but directly from the Head, loosing the Band which binds them unto Him. *These while Christian bodies retain,* they are, so long, like the river which "went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted and became into four heads." . . .

. . . Unknown in face, in place separate, different in language, *opposed, alas!* in some things to one another, still before the Throne of God, *they are one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church* (pp. 56, 57).

Our author then regards every society of Christians as an integral portion of the Catholic Church, which is governed by a validly consecrated bishop whom Dr. Pusey would regard as orthodox;\* which ministers validly the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist; and which professes in words and formulæ the Church's ancient Creeds.† It is manifest, therefore, that as he does not consider *hierarchical* unity, so neither does he regard *visible* unity in any sense, as appertaining by God's

---

\* We understand him to mean, that no one who rejects any portion of the Faith (as he understands that term) can be a Catholic, or, consequently, a Catholic bishop.

† We thus express his last condition, because even Dr. Pusey cannot imagine that all members of the Establishment really embrace the Verities which those Creeds declare. However, if he does really mean to include among the conditions of Catholicism that a society shall enforce on *all her members* belief in the ancient Creeds, our argument against him does but become stronger; because no one will say that the Church of England enforces this.

Command to the Catholic Church. It is most desirable, he thinks, for her well-being, but by no means essential to her existence. Now, if there is one doctrine more than another in which there is not even a *primâ facie* appearance of discord in patristic teaching, it is the doctrine that visible unity is an essential attribute of the Church; nay, and one most special means whereby she is discerned. If any of our readers is otherwise than keenly alive to this circumstance, let him look through the collection of passages cited by Dr. Murray in his admirable treatise (vol. i., pp. 477-505); or those collected by Mr. Waterworth in his singularly serviceable work, "The Faith of Catholics." To select any extracts in particular, would be to weaken the force of our argument. We will but cite Cyprian's well-known words, as a sample of the Fathers' unanimous testimony.

Part a ray of the sun from its orb, this division of light the unity allows not; break a branch from the tree, *once broken, it can bud no more*; cut the stream from its source, *the remnant dries up*. Thus the Church, flooded with the light of the Lord, &c. Does any one believe that *this unity can be rent asunder in the Church? He who holds not this unity, holds not the law of God? . . . Christ's people cannot be rent. . . . There is one God and one Christ, and the Church is one, and the faith one, and the people one, joined into the solid unity of one body by the glue of concord. Unity cannot be sundered, nor the one body be separated by the dissolution of its structure.*" \*

Dr. Pusey enlarges in most glowing language (p. 287) on the Church's purity and spotlessness in the time of S. Augustine; though we firmly believe that had he then lived and been born of heretical stock, he would have experienced the same obstacles to conversion which now retain him in (what we, of course, consider as) heresy and schism. But let us ask him what was held by S. Augustine and by his Catholic contemporaries, on the Church's visible unity? Cardinal Wiseman, in the essay to which we have already referred, supplies an answer, Nor does it in the least concern our present purpose, whether the Donatists did or did not deny Catholicism to others; for our concern is merely with the doctrine laid down by S. Augustine and the rest, as the one undoubted Apostolic truth. We wish our author would read carefully the Cardinal's whole treatise, which he seems never to have seen; but the following words of S. Augustine will serve as a specimen:—

"That you should be found separated from the communion of the entire world (which is a *wickedness* most grievous, *manifest*, and common to you all), if I wished to show its aggravation, time would fail me before words."

---

\* We have adopted Mr. Waterworth's translation.

"It seems, indeed, to be a fixed notion with" S. Augustine, admitted F. Newman when arguing for Anglicanism, "that the Universal Church is that which is diffused through all countries; and that 'diffused,' an expressive word, *includes the idea of active communion.*"\* Nor will anyone think of denying, that in this S. Augustine simply repeats the universal Catholic conviction of his time.

Again, Dr. Pusey speaks with very high approval of Mr. Allies' great Anglican work; considering that gentleman to have written it "not as a partisan, but as the fruit of investigations as to whose issue he was indifferent" (p. 237, note 2). What then was "the fruit" of his "investigations," pursued under circumstances so favourable to the discovery of truth? "*No other idea,*" he says, "about the Church *prevailed up to S. Gregory's time,*" than that she was "one organic whole; a body with one Head and many members."† And by the term, "one organic whole," he means precisely what we have called "hierarchically one"; as is evident from the circumstance, that he regards this "essential law" of the Church as maintained by Roman Catholics, but as having been "broken" by Anglicans.‡

And there is one fact to be finally mentioned, which renders the force of these overwhelming testimonies peculiarly conclusive and irrefragable. While patristic authorities on the Roman side are so vast and so multifarious, not so much as one single isolated statement can be found, in any hole or corner of Christian Antiquity, issuing from any one writer accounted Catholic and orthodox, which gives so much as a superficial or colourable sanction to Dr. Pusey's theory. We refer of course to his theory, that every society remains a portion of the Catholic Church, so long as it is governed by an "orthodox" bishop and retains the other notes which he mentions, though remaining external in communion to the rest of Christendom. And we make our statement with perfect confidence; for if any one such passage could possibly have been found, so learned a theologian as Dr. Pusey would long since have produced it.

Our readers will be curious to know, how a writer, so deeply versed in Christian Antiquity, meets this mass of patristic testimony; and we are deeply grieved at the answer which we must give to the inquiry. He does not attempt to face it, but

---

\* *British Critic*, for January, 1840, p. 65.

† "Church of England cleared from the charge of Schism." Second edition, pp. 500, 501.

‡ P. 502.

ignores it throughout the volume. From the beginning of his book to the end, there is not one sentence which would lead a reader to imagine that any such testimony exists; while he speaks throughout in a tone of undoubting confidence, on the harmony of his own doctrinal views with the patristic, which, under the circumstances, is truly unaccountable and deplorable.

We have seen, then, how violently opposed is our author's tenet on ecclesiastical unity to the uniform and most undeniable teaching, both of Scripture and of Antiquity. Its wild untenableness will be further made apparent, if we consider its intrinsic character, and the practical consequences to which it would legitimately lead. And here some apology seems really required for the extraordinary unreality of the discussion which is to follow:—our obvious defence, however, being, that the fault lies, not with ourselves, but with the incredible extravagance of our opponent's theory.

1. It is not an inference from it, but merely a statement of it in other words, that no "orthodox" bishop, who teaches his flock "orthodox" doctrine, and provides for their valid reception of Baptism and the Eucharist, can by possibility be in a state of schism; even though he separates absolutely from the whole remaining Christian body. Such a procedure may evince a very unchristian spirit, but in no respect makes him cease from being a Catholic.

2. It is, of course, schismatical and mortally sinful, for any Christian to separate himself from the Catholic bishop who is lawfully placed in authority over him. In the case, therefore, above supposed, all individual members of the flock are, without exception, under a strict obligation of remaining under the bishop's government. Apply this. If there is any "bishop" whom Dr. Pusey would regard as undeniably "orthodox," it is Dr. Hamilton; and he is now, by hypothesis, legitimate bishop over the "diocese" of Salisbury. At any future time, therefore, Dr. Hamilton, rightly or wrongly,—from dislike of Privy Council judgments or from some other cause,—may quit the Establishment, and set up on his own account. All the members of his "diocese," without exception, will then be obliged to leave the Establishment with him, under pain of mortal sin. Every Englishman thenceforward who worships in the ancient churches of that "diocese," commits mortal sin; all are obliged to resort to the chapels in which Dr. Hamilton's nominees officiate.

3. Nay, since Dr. Pusey defends (p. 66) what was done by the Anglican Reformers, a further inference follows. As

regards any doctrinal matter on which the "undivided Church" has not spoken, Dr. Hamilton may draw out thirty-nine or any other number of articles, expressing such tenets as he judges to be in accordance with Scripture and Antiquity. He may refuse to "ordain" any except those who will subscribe these articles; and all the flock are required to attend the ministration of these clergymen, and of none others.

4. There have been "bishops" of the Establishment, whom even Dr. Pusey will admit to have been heretical. Our own conviction is, that very few of these "bishops" have been on a level even with his own standard of orthodoxy; that very few of them have ever really accepted the teaching of the early Councils. But even Dr. Pusey will admit, *e.g.*, that Dr. Whately, of Dublin, advocated Sabellian tenets; Dr. Hoadley, of London, Arian; and Dr. Hampden, of Hereford, some still deeper form of misbelief. We will not speak here of modern cases; we will refer to Dr. Hoadley of London. He was an Arian. Was he also a Catholic? Is there to be a new kind of epicene, the heretical Catholic? But if he was not a Catholic at all, he was not a Catholic bishop. It follows, therefore, that during his whole tenancy of the "See," the Establishment members of his "diocese" were external to the Catholic Church.

5. They were, therefore, under the obligation of leaving their present communion, in order that they might be united to that Church which Christ founded. Moreover, there was a bishop whom even Dr. Pusey accounts orthodox, who at that very time claimed spiritual jurisdiction over them, as due to him by the Law of God; viz., the then Vicar Apostolic of the London district. All these members of the Establishment, therefore, if they had but known it, were at that time under an obligation of becoming Roman Catholics.

6. But our author will, of course, admit, that to communicate with an heretical bishop whose opinions are known, is to forfeit the Catholic name. Hence, all the Establishment "bishops" contemporary with Dr. Hoadley forfeited the Catholic name; and all members of the Establishment were under the obligation of becoming Roman Catholics.

7. And since the whole Establishment at that time fell from the Church, it is difficult to see how it was ever rehabilitated. The Vicars Apostolic became the legitimate bishops of all Englishmen; nor have they ever, from that day to this (in our author's own view), either fallen from orthodoxy; or failed so to teach their flock; or omitted to provide for the ministration of Baptism and the Eucharist.

So much on the Establishment. Let us next see the

application of the author's theory to our own communion. Two points will here suffice.

1. Dr. Pusey claims to have discovered with perfect certainty, by historical investigation, that the doctrine of a supremacy over all other bishops, divinely given to the Pope, is contrary to Apostolic teaching. He does not claim for himself exceptional perspicacity and illumination; but holds that every candid inquirer must come to the same conclusion. Well: a candid Roman Catholic, we will suppose, does inquire, and does come to the same conclusion. What is he to do? He cannot continue to believe with Divine Faith what he recognises as contrary to God's teaching; and yet if he does *not* believe this doctrine, he is excluded from the Church. Such, then, is the upshot of this laborious trifling. "God has founded a Church, and requires all men to enter her communion. Yet he permits her to fall into such a state, throughout what is by far her largest portion, that no men can believe what He has taught, without being excluded from that Church with which He commands them to be united."

2. Then what can be a more heinous offence against the Church's constitution, than exciting men to rebellion against their legitimate and Catholic bishop? Yet, according to Dr. Pusey, in the "diocese," say, of Salisbury, this is done in various degrees by every Roman Catholic, from the Bishop downwards. Nor is this all. The Pope and the whole Roman Catholic Episcopate assiduously teach that such conduct is not merely admirable, but (on due occasions) of obligation. Such is the mutual relation of those two societies, which the author holds to be sister societies, and true portions of the One Catholic Church.

Lastly, it is very safe to say, that the theory laid down by Dr. Pusey on ecclesiastical unity, is not at this day held by fifty persons throughout all Christendom; we doubt if it is held by five. The author, on his own showing, differs from the "Easterns" no less than from the "Westerns." "If all Christians," says a Photian bishop, quoted by Dr. Pusey (p. 63), "were agreed on this chief point how the Church was to be governed, *whether by aristocratic rule as we think, or monarchical as the Latins think*, there would be very little trouble in agreeing about the rest" (p. 63). The Church's *hierarchical unity*, then, is as fully held by the "Easterns" as by Roman Catholics themselves; both alike have "apostatized" from that "Divine Truth" on ecclesiastical unity, which Dr. Pusey has rediscovered. The Church has simply failed in her office of guarding the Deposit. She has totally forgotten the very constitution given to her by



God; which would have remained absolutely unheard of in these days, had it not been disinterred by the historical exploration of a few zealous Anglicans.

To pursue further this phantom theory, is like running a worn out joke to death. That Dr. Pusey could find none to allege more plausible, more colourably reconcilable with Scripture and Antiquity, is a virtual confession of defeat. We will say no more, therefore, on this most curious tenet, but look at the broad and general aspect of facts. And to judge from this broad and general aspect, never, surely, was there a more wonderful delusion, than the idea that the Roman and Anglican communions are joint portions of that Church, throughout which "the Holy Ghost maintains the tradition of the great body of the faith infallibly fixed" (p. 93).

As to the Roman Church (as we have already pointed out), she requires all her children as a condition of communion, to hold firmly, as divinely revealed, a certain doctrine concerning the Church's constitution, which Dr. Pusey regards as directly contradictory to Apostolic teaching, and, therefore (by necessary consequence), as heretical. Again, Dr. Pusey holds it to have been taught by the Apostles, as part of the Deposit, that every human person born since the Fall has been under the dominion of original sin. But the Holy Father has fulminated an anathema against every one who should hold this in the case of our Blessed Lady; the Roman Catholic Episcopate has united in that anathema; nor would any Roman Catholic priest dream of giving Absolution, to one who follows what Dr. Pusey considers the Apostles' teaching. Lastly, our author thinks that the Roman Church refers her children for salvation to Mary, and not to Jesus.\* And yet he says that God the Holy Ghost "*maintains in the Church everywhere* the tradition of the great body of the faith infallibly fixed." What *can* he mean?

Unspeakably more amazing is the statement, that within the Church of England "the great body of the faith is infallibly fixed;" that she is "a continual, unchanging teacher of the truth which Christ revealed" (p. 10). It would really be paying too great a compliment to an allegation so extravagantly false, if we examined it in any detail or at any length. A few brief suggestions will amply suffice. We will consider it under two heads: first, we will inquire how far members of the Establishment have been taught to retain those verities,

---

\* "The practical answer to the Roman Catholic seems to be, 'Go to Mary and you will be saved.' . . . In our own belief it is, 'Go to Jesus and you will be saved'" (p. 182).

which were defined by the earlier Councils; secondly, we will refer to those special heresies which emerged three hundred years ago, with the view of considering how far the Church of England has borne faithful testimony, or any kind of testimony, against them.

As to the first-named inquiry, we will begin with the straightforward statement of an Anglican writer, put forth more than twenty years ago; a writer who, so far from having "Roman tendencies," considers, "that no possible circumstances could justify individual Anglicans in entering the *Romish* communion, short of a general and total apostasy in every other branch of the Church." This writer draws the following contrast between the Establishment and the Early Church. "Would it not be possible," he asks, "to preach *every heresy* condemned by" the first four "Councils, *in nine pulpits out of ten* in England, *without a murmur*, to say nothing of a censure? Nay, is it not a fact, that the *clearest heresies*, condemned over and over again, are taught, not only orally, but *in print*; and this, too, *without an attempt*, on the part of the Church, at *canonical and ecclesiastical branding*? Would the Church of the Fathers have permitted, without formal protest, *one half of its clergy* to deny *Baptismal Regeneration and the Apostolic Succession*? Can we conceive the early Church *disputing and questioning*, whether it did or did not hold the *simplest fundamentals of the Christian faith*? Would not the communion of *Athanasius* have risen as one man, with a voice alike *indignant and uniform*, against what is now *passed over unquestioned*?"\*

But the case against Dr. Pusey becomes stronger, by looking at his own chosen champions. That there has been, from the Reformation downwards, a large body of Anglican divines, whose avowed Rule of Faith has been private judgment exercised on Scripture; and who have denounced as anti-Christian the very notion of ascribing infallibility to any Council whatever;—this is so notorious a fact, that even Dr. Pusey cannot close his eyes to it. In reply, he would lay stress on a certain catena of theologians—Laud, Field, Jeremy Taylor, Bramhall, Pearson, Bull, Waterland—who, as he thinks, have faithfully witnessed the ancient Faith. Of course, it is manifest on the surface, that for the Anglican Church to *permit* the teaching of that Faith is a most widely different fact from her teaching it herself. But what did these theologians at last really teach? We will not here speak of Bull and Waterland, who lived in what Dr. Pusey considers an age of most serious declension. But what of Laud, Field, Bramhall, Taylor, who

---

\* *Christian Remembrancer*, for November, 1843, p. 257; see note, p. 365.

were among her greatest ornaments in her most flourishing period?

F. Newman tells us that Bramhall vindicates as orthodox both the Nestorian and Eutychian heretics of his own day.\* Mr. Palmer (on *the Church*, vol. i., p. 418) not only mentions that Jewell, Usher, and *Laud*, are apparently of this opinion, — *Field* expressly maintains it, — but is also an authority for the following distinct and unmistakable facts: that the Nestorians, up to this very time, reckon Nestorius and Diodorus and Theodore of Tarsus among the Saints,† and anathematise the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon; and that the present Eutychians continue to treat the doctrine of the Church as heretical, and to brand those who hold it as Chalcedonians.‡

Such are the misbelievers who were considered as orthodox, by Anglican authorities no less eminent than *Laud*, *Bramhall*, and *Field*. And yet the heterodoxy of these latter is really trifling, when compared with that of *Jeremy Taylor*. We quote again from F. Newman:—

*Jeremy Taylor* goes further still, that is, is still more consistent; for he not merely acquits of heresy the existing communities of the East who dissent from the third and fourth Councils, but he is bold enough to attack the first council of all, the Nicene. He places the right of private judgment, or what he calls "the liberty of prophesying," before all Councils whatever. As to the Nicene, he says, "*I am much pleased with the enlarging of the Creed which the Council of Nice made, because they enlarged it in my sense; but I am not sure that others were satisfied with it.*" "That faith is best which hath greatest simplicity; and . . . it is better, in all cases, humbly to submit, than curiously to inquire and pry into the mystery under the cloud, and to hazard our faith by improving our knowledge. If the Nicene Fathers had done so too, possibly the Church would never have repented it." "If the article had been with more simplicity and less nicety determined, charity would have gained more, and faith would have lost nothing." And he not only calls *Eusebius*, whom it is hard to acquit of heresy, "the wisest of them all," but actually praises the letter of *Constantine*, which I have already cited, as most true in its view and most pertinent to the occasion. "The Epistle of *Constantine* to *Alexander* and *Arius*," he says, "tells the truth, and chides them both for commencing the question; *Alexander* for broaching it, *Arius* for taking it up. And although this be true, that it had been better for the Church it never had begun, yet, being begun, what is to be done in it? Of this also, in that admirable epistle, we have the Emperor's judgment . . . for, first, he calls it a certain vain piece of a question, ill begun and more unadvisedly published . . . a fruitless contention, the product of idle brains, a matter so nice, so obscure,

\* *Anglican Difficulties*," pp. 271-2.

† *Ibid*, p. 419.

‡ *Ibid*, p. 422.

so intricate, that it was neither to be explicated by the clergy, nor understood by the people; a dispute of words. . . . It concerned not *the substance of faith, or the worship of God, nor any chief commandment of Scripture* . . . the matter *being of no great importance, but vain and a toy* in respect of the excellent blessings of peace and charity." When we recollect that the question confessedly in dispute was whether our Lord is the Eternal God or a creature, and that the Nicene symbol against which he writes was confessedly the sole test adequate to the definition of His Divinity, it is *scarcely conceivable* that a writer should believe that Divinity and thus express himself.

"Taylor," proceeds F. Newman :—

Is no accident in the history of the *Via Media*; he does but speak plainer than Field and Bramhall; and soon others began to speak plainer than he. The school of Laud gave birth to the latitudinarians; Hales and Chillingworth, their first masters, were personal friends of the Archbishop, whose indignation with them only proves his involuntary sense of the tottering state of his own theological position. Lord Falkland again, who thinks that before the Nicene Council "the generality of Christians had not been always taught the contrary to Arius's doctrine, *but some one way, others the other, most neither,*" was the admired friend of Hammond; and Grotius, whose subsequent influence upon the national divines has been so serious, was introduced to their notice by Hammond and Bramhall.\*

These were the Establishment's most orthodox divines at its most orthodox period. What must have been—what must be—the *general* orthodoxy of bishops, of clergy, of people? "If the light that is in thee is darkness, how great shall the darkness be!"

We are now to contemplate the Church of England in her dealing with the heresies of the sixteenth century; and, firstly, as to that most desolating of all, Luther's detestable tenet of justification by faith only. "There is not," says Dr. Pusey (p. 19), "one statement in the elaborate chapters on Justification in the Council of Trent, which any of us could fail in receiving." He admits, then, that the Lutheran tenet is heretical, but thinks that no one of his communion holds it. "I never met with any" evangelical, he had said (p. 5), "who held the Lutheran doctrine of justification, that justifying faith is that whereby a person believes himself to be justified."

Now there are two importantly different senses, in which these last words may be understood. The author, at first sight, seems to affirm that he never met with any who *professed* Luther's tenet. If this be so, we can only account for so strange

---

\* Newman on "Anglican Difficulties," pp. 316-8.

a fact, by remembering that no evangelical would cultivate familiar intercourse with Dr. Pusey, unless his evangelicalism were of a most moderate and feeble type. But something quite different may, in fact, be intended: viz., that whatever evangelicals may *profess*, he never met with any one who, in his judgment, *really held (au fond)* the tenet in question. To which (if he means this) we must straightforwardly reply, that nothing can be more untrustworthy than a man's judgment on what others *really hold*; and that, considering Dr. Pusey's strange blindness to all flaws in his own communion, there is hardly any one whose judgment on the matter would not be more trustworthy than his.

That the great body of Anglican evangelicals *do* profess Luther's tenet on justification, is most certain and notorious. His commentary on the Galatians is among their favourite and most authoritative works. Then there is no volume which may more reasonably be taken as representing them, than one which, we believe, is the latest exposition of their views. We refer to "Ten Sermons upon the Nature and Effects of Faith," by Dr. O'Brien, the Protestant bishop of Ossory: of which the first edition appeared in 1833; but the second (from which we shall quote), only two years ago, the work having been out of print from a very early period after its publication.

All those venerable men, he says [Luther, Calvin, and the rest], to whom God assigned the glorious task of overthrowing false religion, and *establishing the true Faith*, have embodied this doctrine of justification by faith only in the confessions of the churches reformed by them, . . . and . . . have emphatically declared that *if this article is lost, all Christian doctrine is lost*" (p. 115).

In a note he appends a long list of extracts from these confessions of faith, to establish his statement. Now, the first two of these extracts expressly state that very feature of Lutheranism, which Dr. Pusey specially mentions; several of them, to our mind, unmistakably imply it; and not one has the slightest tendency in an opposite direction. The two which express it are these:—

"Confession of Augsburg." Our churches teach that men . . . are freely justified, for Christ's sake, *through faith*, when they *believe that they are received into grace, and that their sins are remitted for Christ's sake*. . . . *This faith God accounts for justice before Him.*

"Saxon confession." But when his mind has been terrified by this voice proclaiming sin (*arguente peccata*), let him hear the Gospel's special promise concerning the Son of God, and let him *firmly hold (statuat)* that *his sins are freely remitted to him*. . . . When he is raised up by *this faith*, it is certain that *remission of sins is given him* (pp. 405, 6).

Elsewhere, Dr. O'Brien quotes with approval another extract from the Augsburg Confession :—

"He who believes that his sins are forgiven him, for the sake of this Mediator, at once (*jam*) certainly receives remission of sins" (p. 492).

But Dr. O'Brien adduces another quotation which has a much stronger claim on Dr. Pusey's consideration; for it is from the Anglican Homilies. Dr. Pusey constantly appeals to these Homilies, as evidence of Anglican doctrine; what will he say of such words as the following?—

"*The only mean and instrument of salvation required on our parts is faith: that is to say, a sure trust and confidence in the mercies of God, whereby we persuade ourselves that God both hath and will forgive our sins; that he hath accepted us again into his favour; that he hath released us from the bonds of damnation,*" &c., &c., &c.

Quoted by Dr. O'Brien (p. 490), from the "Sermon on the Passion," included in the Homilies. That the Lutheran tenet then on justification is heretical, Dr. Pusey admits; that it extends widely through his communion, and has received no kind of check (to say the least) from authority, is abundantly certain.

Our author himself confesses to the existence of *Calvinism* in the Church of England; \* and we are sure he will not deny its heretical character. He who holds with Calvinists "the indefectibility of grace"—in other words, the doctrine that no man who has ever received grace can possibly be at enmity with God—contradicts the whole body of patristic teaching quite as plainly and undeniably, as though he advocated the Arian or Nestorian heresy. Still, though the author admits the existence of Calvinism among his co-religionists, one would never obtain from his volume the least notion of that *pre-eminence* which the Calvinistic body at one time enjoyed. The following quotation from Heylin, as to the time of Queen Elizabeth, appeared in the *British Critic* of 1842 :—

"It cannot be denied, that by error of these times, *the reputation which Calvin had attained in both universities*, and the extreme diligence of his followers, for the better carrying on of their own designs, *there was a general tendency to his opinions in the present controversies*; so that it is no marvel if many men of good affection to that Church in government and forms of worship, might unawares be seasoned with his principles in point of doctrine; his Book of Institutes being for the most part the foundation on which the young divines of those times did build their studies; and having built their

\* "To other" Evangelicals, "*who were not Calvinists*, I used to say," &c. (p. 5).



studies on a wrong foundation, did publicly maintain some point or other of his doctrines. *Of any man who publicly opposed the Calvinian tenets in the University (Oxford), till after the beginning of King James's reign, I must confess that I have hitherto found no good assurance*; though there were some who spared not to declare their dislike thereof, and *secretly* trained up their scholars in other principles. We find but two (Dr. Buckridge and Dr. Houson) named for anti-Calvinists *in the five controverted points*. Yet might there be many others, perhaps some hundreds, who held the same opinions with them, and discovered not themselves, or broke out into any open opposition, as they did at Cambridge. God had 7,000 servants in the realm of Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal, though we find the name of none but the prophet Elijah, the residue keeping themselves so close, for fear of danger, that the prophet himself complained to God that he alone was left to serve Him; a parallel case to which may be that of the Christians during the power and prevalency of the Arian heretics; S. Jerome giving us the names of no more than three who had stood up stoutly in defence of the Nicean Council, S. Athanasius, S. Hilary, and S. Eusebius, though it is most clear (by inferences from history) that it was preserved by many others.

But if none but the three bishops had stood unto the truth, yet had that been sufficient to preserve the Church from falling *universally* from the faith of Christ, even as a king invaded by a foreign enemy doth keep possession of his realm by some principal fortress, the standing out whereof may in time gain all the rest. Which I return for answer to the objections, touching the paucity of those authors whom we have produced in maintenance of the anti-Calvinian or old English doctrines; for though they be few in number, and make but a very thin appearance,—*apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto*, in the poet's language,—yet even for a good assurance, that the Church still kept possession of her primitive truths, *not utterly lost, though much endangered by such contrary doctrines as had of late been thrust upon her.*—*Heylin's Tracts*, p. 626.

It is much to be remarked in this passage, that Heylin distinctly regards Calvinism as a heresy, and parallels it with Arianism. As to his attempted defence from the early Church, it fails precisely in the very point at issue: for the orthodox, as every one knows, held it a sacred principle to refuse communion with the Arians; and the Church in communion with Rome is steadfastly vindicated by Roman Catholics, as having never been sullied for a day with the profession of heresy. In this passage, on the contrary, Heylin, with all his zeal for making out the best possible case for his Church, is unable to point to any ecclesiastical authority whatever (much less any claiming to be supreme) which even lifted up its voice against the heresy *as* heresy. The very foundation of ecclesiastical studies, he says, at that time, was directly heretical.

The article which contains this quotation is attributed to a writer who has never exhibited the least Romeward tendency.

Dr. Pusey, then, will hear without suspicion his testimony on the matter :—

Our Reformers, at parting, left the Church in the hands of a *Calvinistic party, who were more really our Reformers than they were themselves*; only bequeathing, as a record of *their own particular influence*, a legacy of *Erastianism* (p. 328). The whole Church, from one end to the other, was flooded with the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism, absolute election, predestination, and the *rest of the five points*. They gained possession of both universities—they were the recognised doctrines of our divinity schools : *it was thought heretical to doubt them* " (p. 332).

And yet it seems to us that, bad as was the Elizabethan era, the principles which prevailed in the following period are, in some respects, even more repulsive to a Catholic mind. Heylin may be taken, one imagines, as a fair representative of Laud's opinions; and he, as we have seen, honestly and expressly designates the prevalent Calvinism as a heresy. Yet in what single instance did either Laud or any of his friends make any attempt ecclesiastically to treat it as such? to withdraw from the communion of these heretics, and become members of some Church, which should testify to Apostolical doctrine as to the one only Truth? The very notion of such a thing seems never to have crossed their mind ever so distantly, even when the Calvinistical tenets were absolutely dominant. The idea of an Establishment, with the King as governor *jure divino*, seems to have been far too deeply rooted in their minds, and too unquestioningly received, to admit of their so much as dreaming of separation from that venerated body and from that idolised head. Certain, at all events, it is, that they treated their opponents simply as a rival party in the same Church; and dealt with the question as an open one in the Establishment. This is the very epoch of his Church, with which Dr. Pusey feels most sympathy; and yet observe once more, at this very epoch, the intimate connection between Anglican "orthodoxy" and undisguised latitudinarianism.

When such a mass of heterogeneous error has been mixed up confusedly within the Establishment from its very origin, no other result could have been anticipated than what we in fact find. "What must I believe; what must I do; in order to salvation?" This is the one question which transcends in importance all others put together. How is it answered among Anglicans?

First as to doctrine. "Take in hand the Bible," says one authority; "all which you see there written, or can prove thereby, is to you Divine Truth; and there is no other." "No,"

says the next clergyman you consult ; "the Bible was never given for the purpose of teaching doctrine. Accept whatever you find written in the six first Councils ; and whatever else is held in common by Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Easterns." "Both these so-called guides are equally behind our age," rejoins a third. "The Bible is not the Word of God, but only contains it ; and as to Roman Catholics and Easterns, they are a set of blind and degraded idolaters. Believe only what commends itself to your enlightened reason."

Next as to practice. "If you would please God," says one clergyman, "strive to obey His commandments." "Such a notion," replies a second, "is simply heathenish, or at best, Jewish. The Gospel has opened a new way of salvation. Trust in your Redeemer ; firmly believe that you are pardoned ; and you are sure of Heaven. Thus, and thus only, can you be saved." "Frequent the Eucharist," says the former, "that you may obtain needful grace." "The Eucharist !" exclaims the latter ; "why it is but an outward sign of an absent Object."

Such are among the divergencies of Anglicanism. By no sophistry can they possibly be represented as in any sense minor or subordinate ; on the contrary, no one can take one single step towards pleasing his Creator, without choosing for himself one of these contradictory rules, and excluding the other. In one parish one road to Heaven is pointed out ; in another, a road which diverges from the former at the very point of starting. Fortunate indeed are those laymen, who are not taught one way of salvation in their youth by their high-church rector, and a contradictory one in their mature years by his evangelical successor.

Never surely was there a stranger phrase, than that which speaks of the Establishment as "teaching" at all. That there are various influences within it, which in a certain sense may be said to teach, we do not deny : but what can Dr. Pusey mean when he speaks of his *Church* as teaching ? When it is said that the Apostolic Church "taught" some doctrine, nothing less is meant than that, through the provisions of her discipline, that doctrine was inculcated on all her children—from East to West, from the highest to the lowest. When it is said that the Roman Catholic Church of this day "teaches" some doctrine, no less full a sense is conveyed. Let provision be made among Anglicans, that all their clergy shall learn one definite scheme of doctrine as divinely revealed, and shall be permitted to teach no other ; then Dr. Pusey will have a right to compare Anglican "doctrine" with Roman Catholic : but as things are now, it is as unmeaning to speak about the

"religious doctrine" of the Establishment, as about the religious doctrine of the Horse Guards or of the Stock Exchange. Many an Anglican, after the Gorham decision or some similar calamity, has consoled himself by saying, "At last the doctrine of the Church of England remains just where it was." His words were much truer than he supposed. "The doctrine of the Church of England" undoubtedly remains in the only place where it ever was, or ever will be; being a dead letter printed upon paper.

And thus we are able to understand a phenomenon which, to Dr. Pusey, is so inexplicable. Demaistre, Bossuet, Dr. Doyle, have made "large-hearted statements" (p. 17) about the comparative orthodoxy of Anglicanism. Why? Because they were never within the Establishment themselves; because their Roman Catholic training had imbued them with a prejudice, that ecclesiastical ideas correspond with ecclesiastical words; and because, in their simplicity, they took for granted the ludicrous supposition, that the Church of England possesses some organisation for inculcating on its members these verities, which are written and printed in its Prayer-book and in its creeds. Archbishop Manning, from years of unhappy experience, well knows the contrary of all this; and he has thus been saved from so droll a mistake.

Such then is the doctrine which we have been endeavouring to vindicate and illustrate. Those truths, which Christ taught, were committed by Him to the keeping of one organised society. This society was wrought into visible union, by the precept of obedience to one supreme central authority; and was gifted with infallibility, both in her formal and her practical teaching, for the purpose of preserving these truths till the end of time. Lastly, we must complete our argument by maintaining that this doctrine on the Church's organisation gives a security different, not in degree, but in kind, from any other, for these two results: (1) that individuals shall elicit real acts of faith, and (2) that the ecclesiastical society shall be really imbued with unity of pure doctrine.

What is Divine faith? Humble submission of intellect to God's Revelation. Now a Roman Catholic is forced, if we may so express ourselves, into this attitude of mind; he is required to believe a vast body of Truth, much of it quite unknown to him in its explicit shape, on no other ground than because the Church teaches it as revealed by God. Intellectual submission to an external authority is the very atmosphere which he breathes. An Anglican, on the contrary, is met at the very threshold by rival schools, differing from each other on the

first rudiments of natural religion, and touting, as it were, for his patronage. He is compelled by force, instead of learning as a disciple, to decide as a judge. The Photian *theory* leads to a similar result, though in practice there is probably much alleviation of the evil. In theory, the Photian accepts various doctrines, because he has satisfied himself, by historical inquiry, that his own communion was right in its quarrel with the Roman. But in practice we may hope, that the great doctrinal unity, which prevails, may often teach him really to accept those *many truths which he has been taught, as coming to him with Divine Authority*, and as claiming his humble and submissive belief on that ground alone.

Next, as to unity of doctrine. "In the case of rude and uncultivated minds, or, again, of men who do not apply their cultivated minds to religion at all, such unity may be sometimes produced by the mere force of inertia, by the merely passive reception of hereditary beliefs. But wherever there is both activity of thought and an application of such thought to the moral and spiritual order, no mode can be imagined (not openly miraculous) for securing religious union, except a common belief in some authority, as having the gift of infallibly deciding on each question as it arises."\* Among Anglicans, both activity of thought very largely exists, and also the application of such thought to the moral and spiritual order: among them, therefore, there is no kind of religious unity. The Eastern schismatics, on the contrary, have great religious unity, because they have so little religious thought. It is the Roman Catholic doctrine alone which can combine, in the case of religious thought, the two inestimable blessings of unity and activity.

That doctrine, concerning the Church's organisation and office, which we have been hitherto conveying in such bald and feeble language, is beautifully expressed by the Archbishop:—

It is not by accident, or by mere order of enumeration, that in the Baptismal creed we say, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church.' These two articles are united because the Holy Spirit is united with the Mystical Body. And this union is divinely constituted, indissoluble, eternal, the source of supernatural endowments to the Church which can never be absent from it, or suspended in their operation. The Church of all ages, and of all times, is immutable in its *knowledge, discernment, and enunciation of the truth*; and that in virtue of its indissoluble union with the Holy Ghost, and of His perpetual teaching by its living voice, *not only from council to*

---

\* DUBLIN REVIEW, for July, 1865, p. 171.

council, and from age to age, with an intermittent and broken utterance, but always, and at all times, by its continuous enunciation of the Faith, as well as by its authoritative dogmatic decrees—("Temporal Mission," pp. 35, 36).

The real ultimate question between the Catholic Church and all Christian bodies separated from it, is not one of detail, but of principle. It is not a controversy about indulgences, or purgatory, or invocations and the like, but of the divine tradition of dogma, its certainty and its purity. The Catholic Church teaches that, as the preservation of the world is creation produced, and a continuous action of the same omnipotence by which the world was made, so the perpetuity of revelation is sustained by the continuous action of the same Divine Person from whom it came.

All bodies in separation from the Church justify their separation on the alleged necessity of reforming the corruptions of doctrine which had infected the Church and fastened upon the dogma of faith. But if the same Person who revealed the truth still preserves it, then it is as unreasonable for man to profess to reform the Church of God as it would be to endeavour to uphold or to renew the world. Men may gird a dome, or reform a political society, but they can no more reform the Church of God than they can give cohesion to the earth, or control the order of the seasons or the precessions of the equinox.

God alone can reform His Church, and He reforms it by itself acting upon itself, never by those who refuse to obey it, and oppose its divine voice. God has reformed the Church by its Pontiffs, and its Councils. A great part of the Pontifical law, and the greater part of the decrees of Councils, as for instance, of Constance and of Trent, are occupied with the reformation not of the doctrines of the Church, but the sins of men. As each man can reform himself alone, so the Church alone can reform itself. But this reformation does not enter into the divine sphere of the faith or law of Jesus Christ, which is always pure and incorrupt, but into the wilderness of human action, human traditions, and the sins which by human perversity are always accumulating (pp. 214-216).

#### Again:—

There are signs upon the horizon over the sea. Protestantism is gone in Germany. The old forms of religious thought are passing away. They are going in England. Separation has generated separation. The rejection of the Divine Voice has let in the flood of opinion, and opinion has generated scepticism, and scepticism has brought on contentions without an end. *What seemed so solid once is disintegrated now. It is dissolving by the internal action of the principle from which it sprung.* The critical unbelief of dogma has now reached to the foundation of Christianity and the veracity of Scripture. Such is the world the Catholic Church sees before it at this day. The Anglicanism of the Reformation is upon the rocks, like some tall ship stranded upon the shore, and going to pieces by its own weight and the steady action of the sea. *We have no need of playing the wreckers. It would be inhumanity to do so.* God knows that the desires and prayers of Catholics are ever ascending that all which remains of Christianity in England may be preserved, unfolded and perfected into the whole circle of revealed truths and the



*unmutilated revelation of the faith.* It is inevitable that if we speak plainly we must give pain and offence to those who will not admit the possibility that they are out of the faith and Church of Jesus Christ. But if we do not speak plainly, woe unto us, for we shall betray our trust and our Master. There is a day coming, when they who have softened down the truth or have been silent, will have to give account. I had rather be thought harsh than be conscious of hiding the light which has been mercifully shown to me. If I speak uncharitably let me be told in what words. I will make open reparation if I be found in fault—(pp. 213, 14).

Surely Dr. Pusey himself cannot call such language as this, "dry, hard, unsympathising" (p. 8). One more extract must be permitted us.

The doctrines of the Church in all ages are primitive. It was the charge of the Reformers that the Catholic doctrines were not primitive, and their pretension was to revert to antiquity. But the appeal to antiquity is both a treason and a heresy. It is a treason because it rejects the Divine voice of the Church at this hour, and a heresy because it denies that voice to be Divine. *How can we know what antiquity was except through the Church?* No individual, no number of individuals can go back through eighteen hundred years to reach the doctrines of antiquity. We may say with the woman of Samaria, 'Sir, the well is deep, and thou hast nothing to draw with.' *No individual mind now has contact with the revelation of Pentecost, except through the Church.* Historical evidence and biblical criticism are human after all, and amount at most to no more than opinion, probability, human judgment, human tradition.

It is not enough that the fountain of our faith be Divine. It is necessary that the channel be divinely constituted and preserved. But in the second chapter we have seen that the Church contains the fountain of faith in itself, and is not only the channel divinely created and sustained, but the very presence of the spring-head of the water of life, ever fresh and ever flowing in all ages of the world. I may say in strict truth that the Church has no antiquity. It rests upon its own supernatural and perpetual consciousness. Its past is present with it, for both are one to a mind which is immutable. Primitive and modern are predicates, not of truth, but of ourselves. The Church is always primitive and always modern at one and the same time; and alone can expound its own mind, as an individual can declare his own thoughts. 'For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man that is in him? So the things also that are of God no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God.' *The only Divine evidence to us of what was primitive is the witness and voice of the Church at this hour—*(pp. 226-228).

We are now in a position to recount the Archbishop's original arguments, and to examine Dr. Pusey's attempt at a reply. Before doing so, we will express our sincere pleasure at the latter writer's explanation (p. 8), that he never intended to include Cardinal Wiseman and Archbishop Manning

among those who were "in an ecstasy of triumph," at that "victory of Satan," the recent Privy Council decision. And now on the matter before us. Dr. Pusey had expressed concurrence with the opinion (p. 8) "that the Church of England is, in God's hands, the great bulwark against infidelity in this land." The Archbishop thought that no Roman Catholic can consistently hold this view; and he gave four chief reasons for his judgment.

First, I must regard the Anglican Reformation, and therefore the Anglican Church, as the true and original source of the present spiritual anarchy of England. Three centuries ago the English people were in faith *unius labii*: they were in perfect unity. Now they are divided and subdivided by a numberless multiplication of errors. What has generated them? From what source do they descend? Is it not self-evident that the Reformation is responsible for the production of every sect and every error which has sprung up in England in these three hundred years, and of all which cover the face of the land at this day? It is usual to hear Anglicans lament the multiplication of religious error. But what is the productive cause of all? Is it not Anglicanism itself which, by appealing from the voice of the Church throughout the world, has set the example to its own people of appealing from the voice of a local and provincial authority?

I am afraid, then, that the Church of England, so far from a barrier against infidelity, must be recognised as the mother of all the intellectual and spiritual aberrations which now cover the face of England—(pp. 29, 30).

To this Dr. Pusey replies: (1) that infidelity is not "the product of one time or clime;" but that "tendencies to unbelief lie deep in man's heart" (pp. 14, 15). The Archbishop, of course, never dreamed of doubting this; but as regards that frightful plague of rationalism which now overspreads Europe, he said, in effect, that its first large and overt manifestation was the Reformation. This most anti-Christian movement brought into active operation men's latent "tendencies to unbelief;" and has visibly generated by lineal descent the calamity under which Christendom now groans.

(2.) Dr. Pusey urges that "the English Reformation cannot have been the cause of the infidelity of the Middle Ages" (p. 15). Now, great as were the faults of the Middle Ages in various ways, can the author gravely contend that infidelity and misbelief were prominent in the number? In those "ages of faith" the chief danger, as every one knows, was that hatred of misbelief might lead men into unwarrantable excesses. The Jews enjoyed peace nowhere except in Rome; and popular zeal for the civil punishment of heretics had to be anxiously watched by the Church, lest it should pass all bounds.

(3.) Dr. Pusey strangely adds that the English Reformation cannot have been the cause of Italian, French, and German misbelief (p. 15). Was the Reformation, then, an exclusively English movement? Did not the English Reformers warmly sympathize with the foreign? Was not the present Establishment reared on the very basis of such sympathy?

Secondly, the Archbishop argued, that though "the Church of England retains many truths in it," yet—

It has in two ways weakened the evidence of these very truths which it retains. It has detached them from other truths which by contact gave solidity to all by rendering them coherent and intelligible. It has detached them from the Divine voice of the Church, which guarantees to us the truth incorruptible and changeless. The Anglican Reformation *destroyed the principle of cohesion*, by which all truths are bound together into one. *The whole idea of theology, as the science of God and of His revelation, has been broken up.* Thirty-nine Articles, heterogeneous, disjointed, and mixed with error, are all that remain instead of the unity and harmony of Catholic truth. Surely this has been among the most prolific causes of error, doubt, and unbelief. So far from the bulwark against it, Anglicanism appears to me to be the cause and spring of its existence—(pp. 30, 31).

He admitted, indeed (p. 31), that individual Anglicans have done much good service, whether in defence of particular doctrines, or of Christianity in general; but then those very errors against which they wrote had been generated by the Reformation. "This is like the spear which healed the wounds it had made." Moreover, he added, the Dissenters oppose infidelity as effectively as the Anglicans.

The extract just given implies a statement which the Archbishop had made a little earlier (p. 22), viz., that "the Church of England rejects much of Christian Truth." To this statement Dr. Pusey replies at some length (pp. 16—20), that she teaches all, or nearly all, which Rome has formally decreed; forgetting apparently altogether, that at Florence the Papal supremacy was defined as of Christ's institution. However, we confess that we have ourselves here some difficulty in following the Archbishop's language; though not on Dr. Pusey's ground, but on one extremely opposite. For reasons already given, we do not see how to admit that the Church of England, as a society, either teaches or holds any doctrine whatever.

In other respects, Dr. Pusey attempts no reply at all to the forcible argument which we have quoted, beyond (p. 11) a few words on the Dissenters. On this discussion we do not care to enter, though we are confident that the Archbishop is simply in the right.

### The Archbishop's third argument was this :—

If the Church of England be a barrier to infidelity by the truths which yet remain in it, I must submit that it is a source of unbelief by all the denials of other truths which it has rejected. If it sustains a belief in two sacraments, it formally propagates unbelief in five ; if it recognizes an undefined presence of Christ in the sacrament, it formally imposes on its people a disbelief in transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the altar ; if it teaches that there is a Church upon earth, it formally denies its indissoluble unity, its visible Head, and its perpetual Divine voice.

It is not easy to see how a system can be a barrier against unbelief, when by its Thirty-nine Articles it rejects, and binds its teachers to propagate the rejection, of so many revealed truths—(pp. 33, 34).

Here again we cannot but think, with all deference, that he has stated the case far too favourably for the Church of England, when he ascribes to her *any* doctrinal teaching. But there is a most certain and palpable fact, which neither Dr. Pusey nor any one else can attempt to deny. The incalculably preponderant majority of English churchmen, high and low, rich and poor, have been trained by the practical system under which they find themselves, to disbelieve five out of the seven sacraments ; the doctrine of transubstantiation ; the sacrifice of the Mass ; the Church's hierarchical unity ; the Papal supremacy. "Marriage," says Dr. Pusey forsooth, "is called a sacrament in the Homilies" (p. 21) ; and so, as we have seen, the Homilies declare Divine faith to be a man's belief in his own forgiveness. Is *this*, then, an authorised Anglican tenet ?

A still more striking fact than any which the Archbishop has happened to mention, and one which should never be forgotten, is, the most deep and pervasive influence exercised by the Establishment, in fostering the bitterest and most violent antipathy to Rome and to the Pope. F. Newman says somewhere that if there is any one tenet common to Anglican theologians of every school, it is that the Pope is Antichrist. Differing in all else, they agree in abhorrence of the Holy See.

Lastly and chiefly, the Archbishop argued :—

It is not only by the rejection of particular doctrines that the Church of England propagates unbelief. It does so by principle, and in the essence of its whole system. What is the ultimate guarantee of the Divine Revelation but the *Divine authority of the Church* ? Deny this, and we descend at once to human teachers. But it is this that the Church of England formally and expressly denies. The perpetual and ever-present assistance of the Holy Spirit, whereby the Church in every age is not only preserved from error, but enabled at all times to declare the truth, that is the infallibility of the

living Church at this hour—this it is that the Anglican Church in terms denies. But this is the formal antagonist of infidelity, because it is the evidence on which God wills that we should believe that which His veracity reveals—(p. 34).

This is that fundamental doctrine, which it has been the main object of our article to maintain against Dr. Pusey. God has willed that Divine Truth should be taught, through the organs and instruments of a living infallible society; organs and instruments who have been so trained by her, that they shall faithfully deliver to all the message with which she has been entrusted. So only can Divine faith be secured; so only can activity of religious thought be harmonised with religious unity. This dispensation of God, the Establishment, by its very constitution, despises and sets at nought. The question is not, as Dr. Pusey thinks (p. 83), of "an ever-present power to declare *new truth*;" but of an ever-present power to declare everywhere faithfully and consistently that one Truth which has been once delivered.

Apart from his reply to the Archbishop—and apart, moreover, from those dreams of corporate union on which we are to speak in our next number—there are two questions on which our author prominently enlarges; viz., Papal supremacy and Marian devotion. We intend, therefore, at a very early period, to treat both these questions, with a careful reference to his course of remark. On the former, indeed, Mr. Allies, in our present number, publishes some most forcible comments, which will receive every reader's earnest attention; and the publication of Dr. Murray's "*De Summo Pontifice*," which may now soon be expected, will give us the desired opportunity of encountering Dr. Pusey in detail on that truly critical controversy. On the Catholic's worship of Mary, again, our readers will have seen with extreme pleasure that the Archbishop promises a volume, which will in due course fall under our review.\* Here we will but state the evidence by which

---

\* "*The Doctrine and Practice of the Catholic Church in respect to the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary.*" By Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster.—Since this article was in type a volume has been advertised with the excellent title of "*Peace through the Truth*," being a collection of "*Essays on various subjects, suggested by Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon*," by the Professors of a Catholic College. Here is a fresh instance of the benefits which will accrue to Catholicism from Dr. Pusey's book.

Since the above note was written, two further works have been advertised: a pamphlet by Canon Oakeley, and a letter to Dr. Pusey from F. Newman. The latter, no doubt, will have immeasurably more personal effect on Dr. Pusey, than all the rest put together.

the Church's doctrine on both these particulars is substantiated and brought home.

The Apostolic Church, as we have so often urged, was constituted by Christ as one hierarchical society: claiming to teach with infallible authority the truths committed by Him to her charge; and inculcating them on all her members, through her various living organs and representatives. It is most certain, moreover, that the Apostles' death was not, by God's appointment, to make any change whatever in her organisation; while Christ and his Apostles had expressly declared, that she was to remain on earth until His second coming. Correlatively with this broad fact on the one hand, there stands forth in history a broad fact on the other hand. From that time to the present, there has always been one, and (speaking generally) there has never been more than one society, precisely answering to the description which we have given; \* this society, therefore, in every age has been the One Catholic Apostolic Church. There have been rare and exceptional periods, we admit—specially the period of that schism which terminated at the Council of Constance—when there were two rival claimants of Apostolic privilege. But the fact that at rare intervals there have been rival claims, does not tend ever so remotely to cause doubt in ordinary times, when there is no such rivalry. The Apostolic Church, such as we have described it, was to last till the end of the world. In the time of S. Ireneus there was one, and one only, such society. In the time of Constantine there was one, and one only, such society. In the time of S. Gregory—in the Middle Ages—at the time of the Reformation—there was one, and one only, such society. At the present moment there is one, and one only, such society. Hence she is the One Catholic Apostolic Church; and her teaching (whatever it may be) on Papal supremacy and on Marian devotion, is infallibly true; simply because it is her teaching.

Dr. Pusey, indeed, adduces arguments to show that this teaching is repugnant to Apostolic doctrine; and the Catholic controversialist is bound, of course, to consider those arguments. Only we beg our readers clearly to understand the real

---

\* It can hardly be necessary to point out that the "Greek Church," as it is called, does not even profess infallibility. Ask any Russian why he believes any doctrine, will he say, because the Church in communion with the See of Moscow cannot err? or the Church in communion with some patriarch he will name, or some specified body of bishops, or the majority of them? No such thing is even alleged. He must give you, as his own *opinion*, that his Church was right in her quarrel with Rome several centuries back; but he will not say that she had any divine *promise* of being right.



state of the case. Let us suppose, for argument's sake, that Dr. Pusey proved his thesis with evidence absolutely irresistible; what would be the legitimate inference? His thesis would not have the faintest tendency to show that the Anglican Society is a portion of the Catholic Church; it would show, on the contrary, that the Catholic Church has ceased to be. And further, since Christ and his Apostles have emphatically declared that she will never on earth cease to be, Dr. Pusey's reasoning would also evince that Christianity is not from God. This is the genuine conclusion, towards which he is so energetically labouring; and if he could but see that the real bearing of his argument, he would be the first to rejoice that it is so conspicuously weak and ineffective. On future occasions it will be our easy task to show, that there is absolutely no force in that train of reasoning, which our author has so sedulously urged against the divine origin of Christianity.

To conclude. We feel quite as keen a grief as he can feel, that in these days, when the hosts of open rationalism and infidelity are so vast and so aggressive, those who would gladly do them battle are not all united in one close phalanx. Yet he cannot surely mean, what his words here and there seem to imply; he cannot surely mean, that for such a reason as this the authorities of our Church are called on to make doctrinal concessions. At the same time he seems at this moment never to have apprehended one simple fact; the fact, namely, that all Roman Catholics regard the doctrine of Papal supremacy, and again, of the Immaculate Conception, as having been no less simply and directly revealed by God, than those of the Trinity and the Incarnation. How could any motives of expediency, were they ten thousand times stronger than even he can think them, justify the Church in compromising that Truth, which God has committed to her care? Would Dr. Pusey, then, himself cultivate ecclesiastical union with Arians, that he might the better repel Jowett and Colenso? Heathenism in the first three centuries was to the full as formidable an enemy to Catholicism, as rationalism can now be considered; yet the presence of a common foe in no way deterred the Church from promptly anathematizing each successive heresy.

But, in fact, any such monstrous attempt at coalition and compromise would be as inexpedient as it would be flagitious. The one secret of intellectual strength is intellectual consistency. Roman Catholics, and they only, are able consistently to contend against the foe, because they only have consistently contended against the foe's fundamental maxims. It is the unhappiness of Dr. Pusey's position, that he is

compelled to join issue with rationalism in detail rather than on principle; that he is precluded from assailing it at its starting point; that he cannot impugn its first principles, without condemning that whole ecclesiastical position, which he is still so resolute to uphold and vindicate.\*

---



---

#### LETTER TO DR. PUSEY BY MR. ALLIES.

DEAR DR. PUSEY,—In a book lately published by you, entitled “The Truth and Office of the English Church,” you do me the honour to make frequent citations from a work of mine, published when I was a clergyman of the Church of England; and in a note at page 237 you remark, “In quoting this book (Allies’ ‘Church of England Cleared from Schism’) I would say that his second work, after that, in despair of the English Church on the Gorham judgment, he left the Church of England, is no real answer to this, which he wrote not as a partisan, but as the fruit of investigations, as to whose issue he was indifferent.” Here are statements, both of fact and of opinion, which it seems to me challenge a reply, and which I do not feel inclined to pass over without one.

And first, there is an error of fact, on which a statement of opinion is grounded. Not the first book only, but both the works in question, “The Church of England Cleared from Schism,” and “The See of S. Peter the Rock of the Church, the Source of Jurisdiction, and the Centre of Unity,” were written and published by me as a clergyman of the Church of England. The preface of the second closes with the words, “My last act as an Anglican, and my last *duty* to Anglicanism, is to set forth, as I do in the following pamphlet, what has induced me to leave it.” The conclusions to which I came, as the result of five years’ study and prayer, in the second book, were so powerful as to force me to give up my living, to leave the communion in which I had been born and bred, and in which all my hopes of prosperity in this world lay, to become a layman in the Catholic Church, and in middle years to begin life anew. This work you describe as the work of a partisan. Of the former work, the result of two years and

---

\* In the preceding article we have incorporated several paragraphs from a long-forgotten pamphlet, published many years ago, by the present writer.

a half of study and prayer, the immediate effect of which was that I felt myself enabled to continue where I was in the Church of England, you say that it was "the fruit of investigations, as to whose issue he was indifferent." I should like you to explain what ground you have for saying that in the one case I wrote a book, which was "the fruit of investigations to whose issue I was indifferent," when the result was that by means of those investigations I was enabled to retain what to most men is not indifferent, their position in the religious communion in which they are born and bred, their profession, and a competent rank and provision in support of it; while in the other case I wrote a book "as a partisan," the immediate result of which was that all these advantages had to be sacrificed? Did you simply mean that when I seemed to defend the Church of England, this was "the fruit of investigations to which I was indifferent," but that when, after double the time, labour, thought, and prayer, I felt I could defend her no longer, I wrote "as a partisan"? To write as a partisan is, I suppose, to write not as one who regards truth before all things, but something else more precious than the truth. What ground have you for saying that this something acted upon me in the second case and not in the first? I venture to think and to assert that I wrote both the first and second book with equal honesty; I wrote neither as a partisan, but for the satisfaction of my own conscience. The first, which you term "the fruit of investigations, to whose issue I was indifferent," carried with it no sacrifice; the second, which you term the work "of a partisan," carried with it a great one: but both were the fruit of investigations, not to which I was indifferent, for that in both cases was impossible, but in which I was determined that no consequences to myself should prevent me from setting forth what I believed to be the truth.

Having said so much on the personal question, with regard to your statement that I wrote the second book "as a partisan," I now turn to the more important point, which, however, you seem to ground on this statement of yours, namely, that my second book is no real answer to the first. Now, you make this assertion to those who are probably unacquainted with both books, one of which was published so long ago as, the first edition in 1846, the second in 1848, and the other in 1850. It is requisite, therefore, that I should give a short analysis of the argument in both cases; and this, I think, will make it clear whether or no the second book is an answer to the first.

The book, then, called "The Church of England Cleared

from the Charge of Schism by the Decrees of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, and the Traditions of the Fathers" consists of two parts: one, the exhibition of the Roman Primacy; the other, a defence of the Church of England. I will take each in its order:—

1. I began by saying,—

The writer of the following pages is more and more convinced that the whole question between the Roman Church and ourselves, as well as the Eastern Church, turns upon the Papal Supremacy, as at present claimed, being of Divine right or not. *If it be*, then have we nothing else to do, on peril of salvation, but submit ourselves to the authority of Rome; and better were it to do so before we meet the attack, which is close at hand, of an enemy who bears equal hatred to ourselves and to Rome; the predicted "lawless one," the Logos, reason, or private judgment of apostate humanity rising up against the Divine Logos, incarnate in His Church.

Having thus laid down that the question whether the Roman Primacy be of divine right or not, is the hinge upon which all turns, I say in p. 19, when speaking of the Primacy, as shown at the Council of Nicæa:—

This precedence or prerogative of Rome, to whatever extent it reached, was certainly, notwithstanding the famous 28th canon of Chalcedon, not either claimed or granted, especially in the West, merely because Rome was the imperial city. It was explicitly claimed by the Bishop of Rome himself, and as freely conceded by others to him, as in a special sense successor of S. Peter. From the earliest times that the Church comes before us as an organised body, the germ at least of this pre-eminence is observable. From the very first the Roman Pontiff seems possessed himself, as from a living tradition which had thoroughly penetrated the local Roman Church, with a consciousness of some peculiar influence he was to exercise on the whole Church. This consciousness does not show itself here and there in the line of Roman Pontiffs, but one and all, whatever their individual characters might be, seem to have imbibed it from the atmosphere which they breathed. S. Victor and S. Stephen, S. Innocent, S. Leo the Great, and S. Gregory are quite of one mind here. That they were the successors of S. Peter, who himself sat and ruled and spoke in their person, was as strongly felt, and as consistently declared, by those Pontiffs who preceded the time of Constantine, and who had continually to pay with their blood the price of that high pre-eminence, as by those who followed the conversion of the empire, when the honour of their post was not accompanied by so much danger. I am speaking now, be it remembered, of the feeling *which possessed them*. The feeling of their brother Bishops concerning them may have been less definite, as was natural: but, at least, even those who most opposed any arbitrary stretch of authority on their part, as S. Cyprian, fully admitted that they sat in the see of Peter, and ordinarily treated them with the greatest deference. This is written so very legibly upon the records of antiquity, that I am

persuaded any one, who is even very slightly acquainted with them, cannot with sincerity dispute it.

Going on rather more than a hundred years, I come to S. Leo the Great, and of him I say, p. 248, that his—

Long and able Pontificate will afford us the best means of judging what the legitimate power of the Roman See was, and how it tended to the preservation and unity of the whole Church. He lived at an important crisis, when the barbarous tribes of the North were about to burst over the Empire and the Church; the system of which, had it not been consolidated by himself, his immediate predecessors and successors, might have been dissolved and broken up into fragments. I will first show, by a few quotations, that S. Leo had no slight sense of his own duty and dignity among his brother Bishops. We will then see how his actions, and the way in which they were received by others, supported his words.

I then quote the following from a sermon of his on the anniversary of his consecration:—

Although, then, beloved, our partaking in that gift be a great subject for common joy, yet it were a better and more excellent cause of rejoicing, if ye rest not in the consideration of our humility: more profitable and more worthy by far it is to raise the mind's eye unto the contemplation of the most blessed Apostle Peter's glory, and to celebrate this day chiefly in the honour of him, who was watered with streams so copious from the very Fountain of all graces, that while nothing has passed to others without his participation, yet he received many special privileges of his own. The Word made flesh already dwelt in us, and Christ had given up Himself whole to restore the race of man. Wisdom had left nothing unordered; power left nothing difficult. Elements were obeying, spirits ministering, angels serving; it was impossible that Mystery could fail of its effect, in which the Unity and the Trinity of the Godhead itself was at once working. *And yet out of the whole world Peter alone is chosen to preside over the calling of all the Gentiles, and over all the Apostles, and the collected Fathers of the Church: so that though there be among the people of God many priests and many shepherds, yet Peter rules all by personal commission, whom Christ also rules by sovereign power. Beloved, it is a great and wonderful participation of His own power which the divine condescendence gave to this man: and if He willed that other rulers should enjoy ought together with him, yet never did He give, save through him, what He denied not to others.* In fine, the Lord asks all the Apostles what men think of Him; and they answer in common so long as they set forth the doubtfulness of human ignorance. But when what the disciples think is required, he who is first in Apostolic dignity is first also in confession of the Lord. And when he had said, "Thou art Christ, the son of the living God," Jesus answered him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father, which is in Heaven:" that is, Thou art blessed, because My Father hath taught thee; nor opinion which is of the earth deceived thee, but heavenly inspiration instructed thee; and

not flesh and blood hath shown Me to thee, but He, whose only-begotten Son I am. And I, saith He, say unto thee, that is, as my Father hath manifested to the very Godhead, so I, too, make known to thee, thine own pre-eminence. For thou art Peter; that is, whilst I am the immutable Rock, I, the corner-stone, who make both one, I, the foundation beside which no one can lay another; yet thou also art a rock, because by my virtue thou art established, so that whatever is Mine by sovereign power is to thee by participation common with me. And upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: on this strength, saith He, I will build an eternal temple, and My Church, which in its height shall reach the heaven, shall rise upon the firmness of this faith. This confession the gates of hell shall not restrain, nor the chains of death fetter; for that voice is the voice of life. And as it raises those who confess it unto heavenly places, so it plunges those who deny it into hell. Wherefore it is said to most blessed Peter, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The privilege of this power did indeed pass to the other Apostles, and the order of this decree reached to all the rulers of the Church, but not without purpose what is intended for all is put into the hands of one. For therefore is this entrusted to Peter singly, because all the rulers of the Church are invested with the figure of Peter. The privilege, therefore, of Peter remaineth, whosoever judgment is passed according to his equity. Nor can severity or indulgence be excessive, where nothing is bound, nothing loosed, save what blessed Peter either bindeth or looseth. But at the approach of His passion, which would disturb the firmness of His disciples, the Lord saith, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren, that ye enter not into temptation." The danger from the temptation of fear was common to all the Apostles, and they equally needed the help of divine protection, since the devil desired to dismay, to make a wreck of all: and yet the Lord takes care of Peter in particular and asks specially for the faith of Peter, as if the state of the rest would be more certain, if the mind of their Chief were not overcome. *So then in Peter the strength of all is protected, and the help of divine grace is so ordered, that the stability, which through Christ is given to Peter, through Peter is conveyed to the Apostles.*

Since, therefore, beloved, we see such a protection divinely granted to us, reasonably and justly do we rejoice in the merits and dignity of our Chief, rendering thanks to the Eternal King, our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, for having given so great a power to him whom He made chief of the whole Church, that if anything, even in our time, by us be rightly done and rightly ordered, it is to be ascribed to his working, to his guidance, unto whom it was said,—“And thou, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren:” and to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, in answer to the triple profession of eternal love, thrice said with mystical intent, “Feed My sheep.” And this, beyond a doubt, the pious shepherd does even now, and fulfils the charge of his Lord; strengthening us with his exhortations,



and not ceasing to pray for us, that we may be overcome by no temptation. But if, as we must believe, he everywhere discharges this affectionate guardianship to all the people of God, how much more will he condescend to grant his help unto us his children, among whom, on the sacred couch of his blessed repose he resteth in the same flesh in which he ruled. To him, therefore, let us ascribe this anniversary day of us his servant, and this festival, by whose advocacy we have been thought worthy to share his seat itself, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ helping us in all things, Who liveth and reigneth with God the Father and the Holy Spirit for ever and ever.

These being the *words* of S. Leo the Great, as to his own office, I give, in p. 252, the following summary of his actions :—

A Pontiff so deeply and religiously impressed with the prerogatives of S. Peter's successor, was likely to be energetic in discharging his duties. In truth, we behold S. Leo set on a watch-tower, and directing his gaze over the whole Church : over his own West more especially, but over the East too, if need be. He can judge Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, as well as Eugubium, and is as ready too. Wherever Canons are broken, ancient customs disregarded, encroachments attempted, where Bishops are neglectful, or Metropolitans tyrannical, where heresy is imputed to Patriarchs ; in short, wherever a stone in the whole sacred building is being loosened, or threatens to fall, there is he at hand to repair and restore, to warn, to protect, and to punish.

In p. 275, I say :—

The question then at issue is, whether the Bishop of Rome be the first of the Patriarchs, and first Bishop of the whole world, the head of the Apostolic college, and holding among them the place which Peter held, all which I freely acknowledge as the testimony of antiquity.

At p. 270 I had already said :—

I am fully prepared to admit that the Primacy of the Roman See, even among the Patriarchs, was a real thing ; not a mere title of honour.

On reading over now S. Leo's statement of his own Primacy, as quoted from my book above, I cannot forbear remarking that Count de Maistre would be quite satisfied so to express the office and prerogatives of the Holy Father, and I feel that our present Holy Father would desire no better exponent of the rights and powers of the Apostolic See than his great predecessor gives in the passage quoted.

But how did his own contemporaries receive it? Did they protest that he was assuming a power never given to his see? Did they declare that in terming himself the special successor of S. Peter, who lived and reigned in his see, he was introducing a new and unknown idea? In pp. 298-302, I give the

synodical letter of the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon to this same Pope. Be it remembered that it was a Council composed of all the great prelates of the East, the Roman legates, who presided in the name of the Pope, being the only Westerns present: that it is one of the four Councils which the Anglican Church still professes to receive as Ecumenical: that therefore, if there be any occasion in all the eighteen centuries on which the whole Church, *according to Anglican principles*, may be said to have spoken, it is by the voice of this Council. I quote then again from my book what this Council said spontaneously to Pope S. Leo, on the very subjects on which, above, we have seen him speaking himself.

First, p. 298, they call the Pope specially the successor of S. Peter, and, as such, the maintainer of the deposit of doctrine descending from Christ, and their leader (*ἀρχηγός*) unto good.

Our mouth was filled with laughter and our tongue with joy: grace has fitted this prophecy to us, by whom the restoration of piety has been accomplished. For what can be higher matter of concern for joy than the Faith? or motive for brighter pleasure than the knowledge of the Lord, which the Saviour himself delivered unto us from above for our salvation, when He said, "Go ye, and make disciples all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." This knowledge descending to us like a golden chain from the command of him who established it, thou hast kept throughout, *being set forth to all men as the interpreter of the voice of the blessed Peter, and drawing upon all the blessing of his faith.* Whence we also, *enjoying the advantage of thee as our leader unto good*, have exhibited the inheritance of the truth to the children of the Church, not teaching each by himself in a corner, but making known the confession of the Faith with one Spirit, with one accord and agreement.

Speaking of themselves as assembled in Ecumenical Council, they say the Pope presided over them, as the Head over the members.

For if, where two or three are gathered together in His name, there He said He would be in the midst of them, how intimately showed He Himself to five hundred and twenty priests, who preferred the declaration of their confession in Him before both their country and their toil? *Amongst whom thou as a head over the members didst preside*, in the persons of those who held thy place, shewing thy good-will.

They speak of the Pope as the one to whom the guardianship of His vine was entrusted by the Saviour; saying of Dioscorus, the deposed Archbishop of Alexandria, that he,

Besides all this turned his madness even against the very one entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vine, thy Holiness we mean.

They term themselves the Holy Father's children :—

We have judged well-timed the confirmation of this honour to it (the rank of the Second See to the Church of Constantinople), by the Ecumenical Council, and have ratified it with confidence, as if it had been begun by thy Holiness, who art ever ready to cherish them : *being aware that every success of the children is reckoned to the parents who own them* (I should have translated, who make it, the success, their own). We therefore entreat that you would honour our decision with your suffrage likewise : *as we have introduced agreement with the head (τῇ κεφαλῇ) in good things, so let your Highness (ἡ κορυφή τοῖς παισιν) fulfil to your children what is fitting.*

Lastly, they leave to him the confirmation of their acts :—

*We have left the whole force of the Acts to you, that you may approve of us, confirming and assenting to what we have done.*

After giving this letter in full, I say, p. 302 :—

He who rejects the Primacy of the Pope, with this letter of the Council of Chalcedon before him, must be prepared to give up the witness of antiquity, and to reject the authority of the Catholic Church.

In p. 491, summing up the whole seven centuries, I say :—

History, then, teaches us that, as a fact, the Primacy of Rome has always existed ; and reverence would suggest that what has always been admitted by the Church of Christ, His Bride, was intended and fore-ordered by Him, with whose voice she speaks.

In p. 313, I had said :—

The primacy, being itself of Divine institution, might yet have greater or smaller privileges attached to it by the Canons of Councils or tacit consent of Bishops.

And again, in p. 315 :—

In truth it by no means follows that because the Primacy is of Divine institution, therefore all the privileges which are claimed under cover of the Primacy, are likewise of Divine institution.

Here then is a summary of the contents of my book, which you say that I wrote, "not as a partisan, but as the fruit of investigations as to whose issue I was indifferent," on the main subject upon which it treats, the Roman Primacy. I began by stating that all turned upon the point whether it was of divine institution or not, and I came to the conclusion, that it is of divine institution, so borne witness to by antiquity, and the authority of the Church, especially as assembled at

the fourth Ecumenical Council, which may be said to sum up and embody the history of the preceding four hundred years, and to interpret and harmonize the whole evolution of the papacy in that time, and thus to corroborate its exercise by S. Leo, that (p. 302,) "he who rejects the Primacy of the Pope, with this letter of the Council of Chalcedon before him, must be prepared to give up the witness of antiquity, and to reject the authority of the Catholic Church," to which I add in p. 491 that he who believes in the Church as the Bride of Christ must believe that what has always been admitted by her, was intended and foreordered by Him, with whose voice she speaks.

What then was the defence of the Church of England which, in the midst of such statements concerning the Roman Primacy, I set up. It is thus stated in p. 366 :—

That during this period (the first six centuries) the Bishop of Rome was recognized to be first Bishop of the whole Church, of very great influence, successor of S. Peter, and standing in the same relation to his brethren the Bishops that S. Peter stood in to his brother Apostles ; this, on the whole, I believe to be the testimony of the first six centuries, such as a person not wilfully blind, and who was not content to take the witness of a Father when it suited his purpose and pass it by when it did not, would draw from Ecclesiastical documents. I have set it forth to the best of my ability, as well where it seemed to tell against the present position of the Church of England, as in those many points in which it supports her.

What then is our defence on her part against the charge of schism ? It is simply this. That no one can now be in the Communion of Rome without admitting this very thing which Pope Gregory declares to be blasphemous and Anti-Christian, and derogatory to the honour of every Priest. This is the very head and front of our offending, that we refuse to allow that the Pope is Universal Bishop. If the charge were, that we refuse to stand in the same relation to the Pope that S. Augustine of Canterbury stood in to this very S. Gregory, that we refuse to regard and honour the successor of S. Gregory with the same honour with which our Archbishops, as soon as they were seated in the government of their Church, and were no longer merely Missionaries but Primate, regarded the occupant of S. Peter's See, I think both the separation three hundred years ago, and the present continuance of it on our part, would, so far as this question of schism is concerned, be utterly indefensible. But this is *not* the point. It may indeed be, and frequently is, so stated by unfair opponents. The real point is, that, during the nine hundred years which elapsed between 596 and 1534, the power of the Pope, and his relation to the Bishops in his Communion, had essentially altered : had been, in fact, placed upon another basis. That from being first Bishop of the Church, and Patriarch, originally of the ten Provinces under the Vicar of the *Præfectus Prætorio* of Italy, then of France, Spain, Africa, and the West generally, he had claimed to be the source and channel of grace to all Bishops, the fountain-head of jurisdiction

to the whole world, East as well as West ; in fact, the "Solus Sacerdos," the "Universus Episcopus," contemplated by S. Gregory. There is a world-wide difference between the ancient signature of the Popes, "Episcopus Catholice Ecclesie Urbis Romæ," and that of Pope Pius at the Council of Trent, "Ego Pius Catholice Ecclesie Episcopus." It has been no longer left in the choice of any to accept his *Primacy*, without accepting his *Monarchy*, which those who profess to follow antiquity must believe that the Bishops of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, Augustine and Chrysostome, the West and the East, would have rejected with the horror shown by S. Gregory at the first dawning of such an idea. And, whereas holy Scripture and antiquity present us with one accordant view of the Universal Church governed by S. Peter and the Apostolic College, and, during the times of the seven Ecumenical Councils at least, as the Bishop of Rome is seen to exercise the Primacy of S. Peter, so his brother-Bishops stand to him as the College of Apostles stood to S. Peter ; instead of this, which is the Church's divine hierarchy, instituted by Christ Himself, the actual Roman Church is governed by one Bishop who has an Apostolical independent power, whilst all the rest, who should be his brethren, are merely his delegates, receiving from his hand the investiture of such privileges as they still retain. If S. Gregory did not mean this by the terms "Solus Sacerdos," "Universus Episcopus," what did he mean ? That the Pope should be the only Priest who offered sacrifice, or the only Bishop who ordained, confirmed, &c., is physically impossible. Nor did the title of the Bishops of Constantinople tend to this : but to claim to themselves jurisdiction over the co-ordinate Patriarchs of the East, as the Popes have since done over the Bishops of the whole world. We have no need to consider what is the amount of this difficulty to Roman Catholics themselves : the same Providence, which has placed them under that obedience, has placed us outside of it. Our cause, indeed, cannot be different now from what it was at the commencement of the separation. If inherently indefensible then, it is so now. But if then "severe but just," the lapse of three centuries in our separate state may materially affect our relative duties. I affirm my conviction, that it is better to endure almost any degree of usurpation, provided only it be not Anti-christian, than to make a schism : for the state of schism is a frustration of the purposes of the Lord's Incarnation ; and through this, not only the English, and the Eastern Church, but the Roman also, lies fettered and powerless before the might of the world, and bleeding internally at every pore. How shall a divided Church meet and overcome the philosophical unbelief of these last times ? or, the one condition to which victory is attached being broken, crush the deadliest attack of the old enemy ? But the schism is made ; let those answer for it before Christ's tribunal who made it. Now that it is made, I see not how a system, which is not a true development of the ancient Patriarchal constitution, but its antagonist, according to S. Gregory's words, can be forced upon us, on pain of our salvation, who have the original succession of the ancient Bishops of this realm, if any such there be, and the old Patriarchal constitution. "*sua tantum si bona norint.*" I ground our present position simply on the appeal to tradition and the decrees of all the Ecumenical Councils.

Again, at p. 446 :—

If it be true that the Pope is Monarch of the Church, which is the present Papal theory, the Church of England is in schism. If it be not true, she is at least clear of that fatal mark. All that is required for her position is the maintenance of that Nicene Constitution, which we have heard S. Leo solemnly declare was to last to the end of the world, viz., that every Province of the Church be governed by its own Bishops under its own Metropolitan. And who then but will desire that the successor of S. Peter should hold S. Peter's place? Will the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Archbishop of Moscow, or the Primate of Canterbury, so much as think of assuming it? Be this our answer when we are accused of not really holding that article of the Creed, "one Catholic and Apostolic Church." Let the Bishop of Rome require of us that honour and power which he possessed at the Synod of Chalcedon, *that, and not a totally different one under the same name*, and we shall be in schism when we do not yield it. At present we have no farther separated from him than to fall back on the constitution of the Church of the Martyrs and the Fathers.

But with regard to this defence it is further stated that the whole question of *doctrine* is reserved. I quote the concluding pages (pp. 505-8) :—

As our defence against the charge of schism rests upon the witness of the ancient Church, thus fully corroborated by the Eastern Communion, so our whole safety lies in maintaining the clear indubitable doctrine of that Church. I have avoided the whole question of *doctrine* in these remarks, both as leading me into a wider field than that which I am obliged to traverse so cursorily at present, and as distinct from the question of Schism, though very closely connected with it. No one can deny that it is not sufficient for our safety to repel one single charge : but this charge was the most pressing, the most specious, and one which requires to be disposed of before the mind can with equanimity enter upon any other. My conclusion is, that upon the strictest Church principles,—in other words, upon those principles which all Christendom, in its undivided state, recognized for eight hundred years, which may be seen in the Canons and Decrees of the seven Ecumenical Councils, and more at large in the actions and writings of the Fathers, our present position is tenable at least till the convocation of a really Ecumenical Council. The Church of England has never rejected the Communion of the Western, and still less that of the Eastern Church : neither has the Eastern Church pronounced against her. She has only exercised the right of being governed by her own Bishops and Metropolitans. There is, indeed, much peril of her being forced from this, her true position. I cannot conceive any course which would so thoroughly quench the awakened hopes of the Church's most faithful children, as that her rulers, which I am loth even to imagine, at a crisis like the present, should seek support, not in the rock of the ancient Church, in which Andrewes, Laud, and Ken, took refuge of old,—not in the unbroken tradition of the East and West, by which, if at all, the Church of Christ must be restored,—not in that great system which first



subdued and then impregnated with fresh life the old Roman Empire, delaying a fall which nothing could avert, and which lastly built up out of those misshapen ruins all the Christian polities of Europe,—not in that time-honoured and universal fabric of doctrine to which our own Prayer-book bears witness, but in the wild, inconsistent, treacherous sympathies of a Protestantism, which the history of three hundred years in many various countries has proved to be dead to the heart's core. Farewell, indeed, to any true defence of the Church of England, any hope of her being built up once more to an Apostolical beauty and glory, of recovering her lost discipline and intercommunion with Christendom, if she is by any act of her rulers, or any decree of her own, to be mixed up with the followers of Luther, Calvin, or Zuingle : with those who have neither love, nor unity, nor dogmatic truth, nor Sacraments, nor a visible Church among themselves : who, never consistent but in the depth of error, and the secret instinct of heresy, deny regeneration in Baptism, and the gift of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation and Orders, and the power of the keys in absolution, and the Lord's Body in the Eucharist. That is the way of death ; who is so mad as to enter on it ? When Protestantism lies throughout Europe and America a great disjointed mass, in all the putridity of dissolution,

“*Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum,*”

judicially blinded, so that it cannot perceive Christ dwelling in His Church, while she grows to the measure of the stature of the perfect man, and making her members and ministers His organs—who would think of joining to it a living Church ? Have we gone through so much experience in vain ? Have we seen it develop into Socinianism at Geneva, and utter unbelief in Germany, and a host of sects in England and America, whose name is Legion, and who seem to be agreed in nothing else but in the denial of sacramental grace, and visible unity ; and all this at the last hour, in the very turning point of our destiny, to seek alliance with those who have no other point of union but common resistance to the tabernacle of God among men ? A persuasion that nothing short of the very existence of the Church of England is at stake, that one step into the wrong will fix her character and her prospects for ever, compels one to say that certain acts and tendencies of late have struck dismay into those who desire above all things to love and respect their spiritual mother. If the Jerusalem Bishopric, the still-born offspring of an illicit connection,

*Cui non risere parentes,*

be the commencement of a course of amalgamation with the Lutheran or Calvinistic heresy, who that values the authority of the ancient undivided Church will not feel his allegiance to our own branch of it fearfully shaken ? “May that measure utterly fail, and come to nought, and be as though it had never been.” The time for silence is past. There is such a thing as “*propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.*” It must be said publicly that such a course will lead infallibly to a schism, which will bury the Church of England in its ruins. If she is to become a mere lurking-place for omnigenous latitudinarianism ; if first principles of the Faith, such as baptismal

regeneration, and priestly absolution, may be indifferently held or denied within her pale,—though if not God's very truths, they are most fearful blasphemies,—the sooner she is swept away the better. There is no mean between her being “a wall daubed with untempered mortar,” or the city of the living God. I speak as one who has everything commonly valuable to man depending on this decision; moreover as a Priest in that Communion, whose constitution, violently suspended by an Enemy for one hundred and thirty years, yet requires that every one of her acts, which bind her as a whole, should be assented to by her Priesthood in representation, as well as by her Episcopacy. To suffer it to be an open question, a matter of doubt, which he who wills may hold, and he who wills may deny, whether or no grace is attached to the acts of the Church, whether or no she has the power and presence of her Lord, whether or no the Body of Christ is really offered on her altars, is a course as intrinsically dishonest and contemptible, as in its effects it must be disastrous. What house with such a rent in it can stand against the first wind that blows? The true position of the Church of England is far other than this. She claimed of old to maintain the Faith of the East and West: her security lies in setting it forth in all its purity, in all its completeness. It is not by dissembling, but by exhibiting the truth in its entire cycle, that she must prevail: not by enduring a secret and dishonest compromise between contradictory principles, but by maintaining *THE FAITH*, that she must fix the hearts of her children, and draw to her those of her opponents. In a negation, in an unreality, no heart can rest. For one rule of life, and no more, hath God given, that which His Apostles preached and planted in all lands: and one bosom only is there in which His children may live in charity and die in peace, that of the Holy Church Catholic. In the hour of need no other support can we find, but that we belong to her who is the Bride of her Lord, the Body whose Head is in Heaven, which grows through all times and climes unto the measure of the stature of the perfect man to be revealed in eternity. One temple only is there which gathers in its vast embrace, its long-drawn aisles and central shrine, the worship of all human hearts: which symbolizes even in its outward form the life of all living beings, and the hope of man—the most holy Trinity and the Cross—God in himself, and God become man, his Saviour, his Food, and his Reward—the temple of the Church Catholic. Thrice blessed would he be, who was allowed by the labour of his hands, the toil of his mind, or the cost of his blood, to restore one stone which had been displaced in that divine structure. More blessed yet it were to remove a wall which the Enemy has been allowed to draw within the divine enclosure, defacing its fair proportions, and obscuring its sacred symbolism; to join together hearts, which, outwardly divided, feed on the same eternal verity of God made man, and only require the knowledge of each other, of their reciprocal aims and hopes, to be united in outward confession as in inward belief, and to embrace in a never-ending charity.

It will be seen from the above that, while attesting all through my book the existence from the most ancient times of the Roman Primacy, and even calling it of divine institution,

while pointing to its exercise by the great Popes, S. Leo in the middle of the fifth, and S. Gregory at the end of the sixth century, as the ideal of the Church's constitution, I ground a defence of the Church of England on two points: first, a supposed corruption of this Primacy, whatever it was, into a monarchy, the nature of which corruption, however, is nowhere distinctly specified; and secondly, an ignoring, or rather an implicit denial of the royal supremacy in the Church of England. I assume the Anglican Bishops to be in possession of those original episcopal powers, which I imagined that the Papacy had taken away from the Bishops of the Roman Church:—

I see not how a system, which is not a true development of the ancient Patriarchal constitution, but its antagonist, can be forced upon us, on pain of our salvation, who have the original succession of the ancient Bishops of this realm, if any such there be, and the old Patriarchal constitution, *sua tantum si bona norint*—(p. 368).

My work was published in February, 1848. Let us see what the lapse of two years did with the two props which I had set up for the Anglican Church.

In February, 1850, a trial in the Court of Arches, as to whether a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England might deny the doctrine of baptismal regeneration had brought out the Royal Supremacy, as the real ruler, and supreme governor, as in fact, *mutatis mutandis*, the Cathedra Petri of Anglicanism.

In years before this, from the end of 1845, when I went to you for advice and consolation under difficulties, your custom was to deny altogether that ugly fact of the Royal Supremacy. I well remember therefore the astonishment with which in that month of February, 1850, I turned over, in Gibson's Codex, the legal proofs of the Papal Supremacy having been transferred to the civil power. The effect which this discovery had upon me is detailed in a pamphlet which I then published, and of which I sent you a copy, entitled, "The Royal Supremacy viewed in reference to the two spiritual Powers of Order and Jurisdiction." I refer you to p. 11, which quotes the act of Parliament, 1 Eliz., c. i., sect. 17, the meaning of which Bishop Gibson puts by its side in these words, "such spiritual jurisdiction as hath heretofore been exercised, shall be for ever annexed to the crown," and his heading of the page is, "Supreme Head of the Church of England, Papal and Regal." The section runs thus:—

And that also it may likewise please your Highness that it may be established and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such Jurisdictions,

Privileges, Superiorities, and Pre-eminences, Spiritual and Ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual and ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempt, and enormities, shall for ever, by authority of this present Parliament, be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm.

Thus the supposed patriarchal constitution, on the possession of which I had rested for the defence of the Church of England, was turned at once into a supremacy of the civil power, which throughout the pamphlet just cited I prove by the testimony of the Fathers to be antichristian.

In the preface to my second book, I describe the effect which the discovery of this supremacy, and its exercise in this instance of the Gorham judgment, had upon the argument of my first book :—

Some years ago the writer, already in great distress of mind at the historical and actual position of the Anglican Church, at the statements of her formularies, at the want of shape and principle in her practice, and, above all, at her general character and temperament as a communion, which seemed to him thoroughly alien from the spirit of the ancient Fathers, betook himself to the special consideration of one point,—the Primacy of the Roman See, which he thought more calculated than any other to lead him to a sure conclusion. . . .

The writer, moreover, then professed, that “he took up this inquiry for the purpose of satisfying his own mind ;” that “had he found the Councils and Fathers of the Church, before the division of the East and West, bearing witness to the Roman Supremacy, as at present claimed, instead of against it, he should have felt bound to obey them ;” and that, as a Priest of the Church Catholic in England, he desires to hold, and to the best of his ability will teach, all doctrine which the undivided Church always held.

He made these professions in the simplicity, it is true, but likewise in the sincerity of his heart ; and he made them publicly before God and man. Now, the conclusion to which he was at that time led by the study of antiquity, was, that a Primacy of divine institution had indeed been given to the See of Peter, but that the degree to which it had been pressed in later times, formed an excuse for those communions which while they maintained the Catholic faith whole and entire, were *de facto* severed from it.

Thus he made these professions when he thought that they led him to one conclusion ; but he is equally bound to redeem them now that in the course of years they have led him to another.

For though his study of the question terminated for the moment at this point, yet the supremacy claimed by S. Peter's See over the whole Church was a subject never out of his thoughts. And, in the mean time, what he saw of the actual state of the Roman Communion in other lands, of the principles on which it was based, and of the fruits which it produced, deeply moved and affected him. That Communion seemed in full possession of the

great sacerdotal and sacramental system for which earnest Anglicans were vainly struggling, as well as of that religious unity, the name of which in an Anglican mouth sounded like a mockery, amid the deep contradictions both as to principles and as to practice, which are equally tolerated and supported by the Establishment. When just at this moment that one only doctrine of all those mooted at the Reformation, which had appeared to him to be as unquestionably taught at least by the formularies of the Anglican Church, as by the ancient Church—the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration—was brought before the tribunal of the Court of Arches, and thence carried, by appeal, to the Queen in Council.

This fact first brought home to the writer the real nature of the Royal Supremacy. Up to that time, without having accurately looked into that power, he had supposed it to be *practically* indeed a great tyranny over the Church subject to it, but in *principle* only a “supreme civil power over all persons and causes in temporal things, and over the temporal accidents of spiritual things.” But the more he considered it in its origin, and with reference to the power which it supplanted and succeeded, and in its exercise during three hundred years, and in its whole tone and demeanour to the communion over which it was “supreme governor,” the more painfully he became convinced that such a limitation, desirable as it might be to quiet the consciences of churchmen, was *as a fact* quite untenable. He felt that at his Anglican ordination as Deacon and as Priest, and subsequently, he had taken an oath of obedience to a power, the nature and bearing of which he did not then at all comprehend—a power which, the moment he came to comprehend it, seemed to be utterly opposed to every principle which he held dear as a Churchman, and to contradict as much the relation of the Church to the State which is set forth in the Holy Scriptures as the teaching of the Fathers and the acts of General Councils—a power which had no parallel in all historical Christianity up to the very time of its enactment, and which not merely enthralled, but destroyed, the continuous life of the Church. For he found that Supremacy of the civil power to consist in a supreme jurisdiction over the Establishment in matters both of faith and of discipline, and in the derivation of Episcopal mission and jurisdiction—not as to their *origin* indeed, but as to their *exercise*—from the Crown or the nation. The writer at once felt that he must repudiate either that Supremacy, or every notion of the Church, that is, the one divinely-constituted Society, to which the possession of the truth is guaranteed, and which has a continuous mission from our Lord for the spiritual government of souls, and the building up that humanity which He redeemed “to the measure of the stature of the perfect man.” The Royal Supremacy, and the Church of God, are two ideas absolutely incompatible and contradictory.

But my heart, my soul, my conscience, and no less my reason, every power and principle within me, were longing, sighing, thirsting for the Church of God, “the pillar and the ground of the truth.”

Any decision to which the Queen in Council might come was unimportant in my sight in comparison to the fact that the Queen in Council had the power of deciding in matters of doctrine.

Thus I felt before the decision came out; but when it came out there was

added a sense of shame, of degradation, and of infamy, which had never before oppressed me, in that I belonged to a communion of which the supreme tribunal, when called upon to declare whether, by its existing rule of doctrine, infants were or were not regenerated by God in Holy Baptism, decided neither that they were nor that they were not, but that the clergy might believe and teach either one, or the other, or both indifferently.

And I felt thus because *any* error and *any* heresy are innocent and innocuous compared to the tenet that error and heresy are indifferent; and *any* legal decision, however erroneous, is *honourable*, compared to that which pronounces it equally lawful to believe and teach that God the Holy Ghost is given, and that He is not given, to a child by a certain act.

Nor can I regard the institution of Mr. Gorham by the Court, and at the fiat, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, under the decree of Her Majesty as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church, to be anything else but a public profession, that the Anglican Church is founded on the most dishonest compromise—one which involves the denial of the whole Christian faith, and the practical establishment of unlimited Latitudinarianism.

And yet I could not but acknowledge that the power which makes this decision is one fully competent to make it. It is that power to which the Anglican Church first submitted itself in 1534, and finally in 1559. It is the power under which it has lived three hundred years, and by whose grant it holds all its property. It is the power to which, during all that time, its Clergy have sworn obedience, as "Supreme Governor;" and the nature of Supremacy is, that what is subject to it cannot call it in question. It is the power which not only nominates, but institutes Bishops; erects, divides, alters, and extinguishes, bishoprics; causes Convocation to be summoned, or not to be summoned; to transact, or not to transact business; confirms or does not confirm its acts; and, in short, the power which constitutes the distinctive character of the Anglican Communion, as to its government, making it to differ both from the Catholic Church and all Protestant sects. Lastly, it is the power which alone makes it a whole, the Cathedra Petri of Anglicanism.

For all these reasons it is a power which binds the Anglican Church, its Clergy, and its Laity, as a whole and as individuals; and, accordingly, a power by the rightness or wrongness of whose decision in matters of faith the conscience of every one in that communion, and his state before God, is touched.

Now, to submit to this particular decision, I must resign every principle of faith as a Christian, as well as every feeling of honour as a freeman;—I would as soon sacrifice to Jupiter, or worship Buddha, or again, take my faith from the civil power;—and to remain in the Anglican Communion is to submit to it.

My defence of the Church of England had been thus completely swept away by the revelation of that civil supremacy which the Gorham judgment exhibited in action. For as soon as it was made clear that what held the Church of England together, that is, the derivation of spiritual jurisdiction from



the civil power, was an antichristian principle, and this thesis I have established in the tract above mentioned, what was there left to defend? I proceed to deal with that supposed corruption of the Roman Primacy into a monarchy, the imputation of which ran through my first book. And here I say, p. xi. :—

In the mean time the nearer consideration of the Royal Supremacy had opened my mind to comprehend the nature of its great antagonist, the Primacy of S. Peter's See. For, as has been said, the former consists in supremacy of jurisdiction, whether viewed as deciding in the last resort upon doctrine, and this as well legislatively, by giving licence to summon Convocation, and by confirming its acts, as judicially, in matters of appeal; or as giving mission and authority to exercise their powers to all Bishops. Now it was plain that such a supremacy must exist somewhere in every system. And immediately there followed the question, What is that *somewhere* in the Church Catholic? I could not even imagine any answer, save that it was S. Peter's Chair. And then I saw that the contest in Church history really lay not between Ultramontane and Gallican opinions, but between the liberty, independence, and spirituality of Christ's Church on the one hand, or on its being made a servile instrument of State government on the other: between a divine and a human Church. And now I went over again the testimonies of antiquity which I had before put together, and many others besides, and I found that one or two confusions and incoherencies of mind—especially the not understanding accurately the distinction between powers of Order and powers of Jurisdiction, and their consequences—had alone prevented my seeing, not merely a Primacy of divine institution, but how full, complete, and overwhelming was the testimony of the Church before the division of the East and West to the supremacy of S. Peter's See, *as at present claimed*, the very same and no other. I had it proved to me by the evidence of unnumbered witnesses, that the charge of such supremacy being originated by the false decretals of Isidore Mercator was a most groundless, I fear also, a most malignant, and treacherous imputation. And, moreover, I felt convinced that those who deny the Papal Supremacy must, if they are honest men, cease to study history, or at least begin their acquaintance with Christianity at the sixteenth century. Also that they must be content with a dead Church and no Creed.

When I had come to this conclusion, it became a matter of absolute necessity and conscience to *act* upon it, to resign my office and function of teaching in the Anglican Church, and not only so, but to leave that communion itself, in which, so far from being able "to hold and teach all doctrine which the undivided Church always held," I could no longer teach, save as an "open question" (from which degradation may God preserve me!), that very primary doctrine which stands at the commencement of the spiritual life.

I leave therefore the Anglican Communion, not simply because it is involved in heresy by the decision of Her Majesty in Council, but because that Royal Supremacy in virtue of which Her Majesty decides at all in matters of doctrine, is a power utterly incompatible with the existence of the Church

of God, and because Anglicanism, as a whole, has not only tampered with and corrupted the entire body of doctrine which concerns the Church and the Sacraments, but as a living system, is based upon the denial of that Primacy of S. Peter's See to which I find Holy Scripture and the Church of the East and West bearing witness ; and which I believe, on their authority, to have been established by Christ Himself as the Rock and immovable foundation of His Church, her safeguard from heresy and dissolution.

The book of which I have cited the preface treats of the Primacy, in the first section, as an existing power ; in the second, as based upon the express warrant of Scripture ; in the third, it defines the end and office of the Primacy ; in the fourth, sketches in what its power consists ; in the fifth, it gives the Church's witness to the Primacy, ranged under seven heads, which are (1.) A General Supremacy the Roman See over the whole Church ; a Supremacy exactly the same in principle with that which is now claimed ; (2.) The grounding of this Supremacy on the attribution of Matt. xvi. 18, Luke xxii. 31, and John xxi. 15, in a special sense to the Pope, as successor of S. Peter ; (3.) The original derivation of Episcopal Jurisdiction from the person of Peter, and its perpetual fountain in the See of Rome, as representing him ; (4.) The Papal Supremacy over the East, acknowledged by its own rulers and councils before the separation ; (5.) The Pope's attitude to Councils, as indicating his rank ; (6.) His confirmation of Councils ; (7.) The necessity of communion with the Pope. The testimonies cited under these seven heads answer incidentally all the historical objections and difficulties which are scattered through the first book. This answer, though incidental, is radical, because it cuts away the very root on which such objections grow. For instance, the objection which most constantly occurred in the first book, which ran indeed all through it, so as to form the main point of aggression on the claim of Rome, is a supposed antagonism between the idea of Primacy and Supremacy. The second book shews by a large induction of testimonies, occupying twenty pages, pp. 77-97, that the idea of Primacy and Supremacy is exactly the same ; that the Supremacy now claimed and allowed is exactly identical with the Primacy as exercised by S. Leo at the Council of Chalcedon, which the first book set forth as the ideal of the Church's true constitution. Again, the first book had dwelt much on the denial of the Supremacy by the Eastern Church ; the second shews, pp. 118-126, how entirely the Papal Supremacy over the East had been acknowledged by the rulers and councils of the East before the separation. And let the positive proof for the Primacy or Supremacy given in these five sections be fairly considered,

and I think it will be found that no great institution existing in the world stands upon a firmer basis, or has less alleged against it.

The two concluding sections contrast the action of the Primacy of S. Peter in the Catholic Church with the action of the Royal Supremacy in the Anglican Church, and the effects of the one with the effects of the other. And here I must repeat, what I have already said, that the Primacy, as set forth in the first five sections, had entirely cut away the standing ground which I had imagined for the Church of England, namely, that it was governed in accordance with the Council of Nicea, by its own Bishops and Metropolitans, allowing the successor of S. Peter to hold S. Peter's place. But in these two sections, this supposed standing ground itself is shown to be most opposed to the real fact; the Reformation having transferred the Papal Supremacy to the civil power in England, so that its national Church, so far from yielding to S. Peter's See the original honour given by the Saxon Archbishops, had a distinct existence only in and by virtue of denying that honour, and of rendering it instead to the civil power.

In the Gorham decision not only is that civil power exhibited as exercising supreme spiritual jurisdiction, but, by a singular concurrence, it exercises it for the purpose of legalizing the grossest heresy. Its attitude was—"My children, here are two great parties among you, of clergy and of laity, the one holding baptismal regeneration as the key of the whole sacramental system; the other denying it, as incompatible with the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Now, I cannot afford to lose either of you: together you make me up: for three hundred years you have gone on, the one holding this doctrine, the other denying it. Pray go on so still. If you don't, I shall go to pieces. Let Mr. Gorham go back to his living; and let him, and all who hold with him, deny baptismal regeneration and the sacramental system. Let all you others, who hold both, preach and teach it as you have done before. I am strong enough to contain you both, and far too weak to lose either." And this was the national Church of a people who count truth and honesty to be the distinctive marks of the national character.

What you thought concerning this decision at the time, I find recorded in the following propositions, which bear your name attached to them.

"To admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of an article of the Creed, contradictory of the essential meaning of that article, is in truth and in fact to abandon that article;" and "Inasmuch as the Faith is one, and rests upon one principle

of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an article of the Creed, destroys the divine foundation upon which alone the entire Faith is propounded by the Church ;” and “any portion of the Church, which does so abandon the essential meaning of an article of the Creed, forfeits not only the Catholic doctrine in that article, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church.”

So you stated in the year 1850. You have since been, for fifteen years, a Presbyterian, a Dignitary, and a Royal Professor in the Church which has so done, and now you come forward with the exact contradictory of these propositions in behalf of the Church which has so done, that is with a book entitled: “The Truth and Office of the English Church.” Now, in the year 1848, in the book which you quote as—“The fruit of investigations, to whose issue I was indifferent”—I wrote, “If the Church of England is to become a mere lurking-place for omnigenous latitudinarianism ; if first principles of the Faith, such as baptismal regeneration and priestly absolution, may be indifferently held or denied within her pale—though if not God’s very truths, they are most fearful blasphemies—the sooner she is swept away the better.” In the year 1850 this very thing came to pass : and I felt that my defence of her in that book had crumbled into dust. In obedience to my principles therefore I left her communion : have you in obedience to yours stayed in it ? Which of us, I ask, has written, and which of us has acted, “as a partisan”?

I am, dear Dr. Pusey,  
Yours truly,

October 26, 1865.

T. W. ALLIES.

## APPENDIX TO THE OCTOBER ARTICLE ON GALILEO.

THE fourth article of our last number was intended to close a short series, on the deference due to those Papal decisions of doctrine, which are not actual definitions of faith; and it dealt particularly with the case of Galileo, which, far more than any other, has been alleged as proving that such decisions are not infallible. On both these questions a few last words are necessary.

Our general thesis was, as our readers may remember, that the Holy Father is not infallible only when he condemns some tenet as heretical, but equally so when he brands it *ex cathedrâ* (as he often does) with a lower theological censure. Consequently, that any doctrine which he teaches in Allocutions, Encyclicals, and other pronouncements put forth by him as Universal Teacher, is none the less infallibly true, though its contradictory be not condemned as actually heretical. To this statement an objection has been made, which we had not thought of treating, but on which stress is laid by some sincere searchers for truth. We will now, therefore, supply the omission.

Here is the objection: Ultramontane controversialists constantly assert that no Papal declaration is *ex cathedrâ*, unless it expresses or implies an anathema on the tenet which it condemns. Without crowding our pages with a series of extracts, F. Perrone may well stand as representing a class. These are his words:—

“By the name of a definition put forth *ex cathedrâ*, is signified a decree of the Roman Pontiff, whereby he proposes to the universal Church something to be believed [as] of faith, or to be rejected as *contrary to the faith*, under penalty of censure or anathema” (De Locis, n. 726).

Where the word “censure” seems used synonymously with that of “anathema.”\* The strongest Ultramontaness, then,

---

\* Many approved theologians use language which appears even more unmistakable. Take Antoine, whom we happen to be consulting on another point: “The Supreme Pontiff is said to speak *ex cathedrâ* when, as Supreme and Universal Pastor, he defines something to be believed and held by all the faithful with certain faith, . . . in such sense that he wills all who think otherwise to be separated from the Church's communion” (De Fide, c. 5, a. 6).

it is argued, do not consider the Pope to speak as Universal Teacher, when he pronounces a lower censure than that of heresy. We shall maintain, in reply, (1) that all these passages are capable of an interpretation totally different from that which the objector supposes; and (2) that this different interpretation is most unquestionably the true one. We do not deny, of course, that a few theologians have *really* denied the Church's infallibility in these minor censures: on the contrary, in July (p. 262), we quoted Dr. Murray's statement that he found three who did so; though not one of the three could rank as an "approved" writer. But as to the eminent authorities on whom our present objector lays stress, we are most confident that they would have been unspeakably surprised, had his interpretation of their meaning been ever presented to them as authentic. We believe the thing to have happened as follows:—

There are two questions, totally distinct from each other, and requiring an examination altogether distinct:—the "subject" and the "object" of infallibility. When I am considering the former, I am considering who *possesses* infallibility; whether, *e. g.*, the Pope alone, or not without episcopal concurrence: but when I am considering the latter, I am considering *over what objects* infallibility extends; whether, *e. g.*, it is confined to definitions of faith, or reaches much further. The former question is now of much less practical moment than once it was, because the Catholic Episcopate invariably assents to all Papal judgments; whereas the latter question is now, it may almost be said, more urgently important than any other whatever.

But in the great controversy between Ultramontanes and Gallicans, which raged so actively two centuries ago, the fact was notoriously just the reverse. To this day, a "Gallican" means, not one who limits the "object" of infallibility, but one who maintains that the Pope is not infallible when speaking *ex cathedrâ*. We are perfectly confident that on both sides it was an admitted principle, that the same authority which is infallible in condemning tenets as heretical, is no less infallible in pronouncing on them some inferior censure.\*

---

\* We may cite, as one proof out of many, a letter cited by Antoine (de Fide, c. 3, a. 5, s. 9), written to the Pope by the well-known Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, and subscribed by most (pluribus) of the French archbishops and bishops. "It was certain," says this letter, "to it [the French clerical body] that nothing is wanting to the Pontifical decrees against Jansenius, in order that they may *oblige the whole Church*. . . I consider that the clergy would have made the same profession also concerning the *Apostolic definitions against Baius, Molinos, and the 'Maximes des Saints'*, had these been in question." Now the condemnations of both



But this particular matter was hardly alluded to; the question which agitated men's minds being quite different. "Can the Pope infallibly condemn heresy?" was the issue, "or is his condemnation liable to error, unless the Episcopate assent?" The Ultramontanes admitted, of course, that the Pope was not infallible, unless he spoke *ex cathedrâ*. "But how do you know whether he is speaking *ex cathedrâ*?" asked the Gallicans. "By this obvious sign," answered their opponents, "that whenever he is condemning a heresy *ex cathedrâ*, he expresses or implies an anathema on its wilful upholders." This phrase is in use to this day among Ultramontane controversialists, in the very same sense in which it was originally employed. When they say that the Pope is not speaking *ex cathedrâ*, unless he expresses or implies an anathema, nothing is further from their mind than what the objector supposes; viz., that he is not infallible in pronouncing censures lower than that of heretical: the question is not in their thoughts at all. What they mean is simply this: that the Pope is not infallible in denouncing some tenet as heretical, unless he so denounces it *ex cathedrâ*; and that such denunciation is not *ex cathedrâ*, unless an anathema be expressed or implied.

Such evidently is an *intelligible* account of the matter; and we are next to show that it is the true account. From the multitude of proofs which throng on our mind, we will select a very few.

1. We believe that, in every single instance, a careful study of the writer's general argument will show clearly the soundness of our interpretation. We have taken Perrone as our specimen: let us exhibit the proof therefore in his case. He at once appends this note to the passage which we quoted above:—

"Wherefore neither do personal facts, nor precepts, nor rescripts, nor opinions which the Roman Pontiffs from time to time express, nor disciplinary decrees, nor omissions of a definition, nor other very many things of the same kind, come under the head of these decrees concerning which we speak. For though all these things—considering the supreme authority from which they issue—should always be held in high estimation, and should be received with humble submission (*obsequio*) of mind and reverence, nevertheless they do not constitute that definition *ex cathedrâ*, of which we are

---

Baius and Molinos contain many censures below that of heresy; while that of Fénélon's "Maximes des Saints" does not speak of heresy at all.

Fénélon, on the contrary, as being an Ultramontane, held as a matter of course that the Pope's condemnation of his book was infallible, independently of any other Episcopal judgment; and this, be it again observed, on a matter where there was no question of *heresy* whatever, but only of minor error. See his words quoted by De Maistre ("du Pape," book i., c. 16) in a note.

speaking, and in which alone we maintain Pontifical infallibility. Compare the remarks, not less apt than prudent, made on this matter (after Canus and Bellarmine) by Pietro Ballerini, 'de vi ac ratione primatûs' (c. 15, s. 10)."

Of course, if Perrone had meant, as the objector supposes, to contrast the censure of tenets as *heretical*, with the censure of them merely as *unsound*,—if he had intended to say that the Pope is infallible in the former but not in the latter office,—such a circumstance must have occupied a prominent place in the above note; for certainly the Pope's fallibility in minor censures would be an immeasurably more important qualification, than his fallibility in precepts, and rescripts, and personal facts or opinions. Then, again, Perrone quotes a particular section of Ballerini, as expressing his own doctrine; but if you refer to that section, you will find that Ballerini therein distinctly implies the Pope's *infallibility* in minor censures. (See n. 42 of the section.)

2. If the objector's interpretation were correct—if the question turned at all on the "object," and not merely on the "subject" of infallibility—the theologians on whom he rests would of course be equally anxious to add the same qualification, when they are speaking, not of the Pope's, but of the Church's infallibility. But, on the contrary, not one of them gives the slightest hint that the Church's infallibility is limited to her condemnation of heresy. Or, rather, they expressly teach the contrary; as, *e.g.*, Perrone in the passage which we quoted last July (p. 122).

3. It frequently happens that the Holy Father, in one and the same pronouncement, condemns a variety of propositions, some as heretical, and others as unsound in a lesser degree. Nay, he does so more commonly, without even specifying which censure belongs to which proposition. According to the objector's interpretation of those theologians whom he cites, they teach that such a pronouncement is *ex cathedrâ*, so far as it condemns *heretical* propositions; but that the very same pronouncement is not *ex cathedrâ*, so far as it condemns propositions *unsound in a lesser degree*. Moreover, where the Pope does not particularly state which propositions are or are not heretical—as, *e.g.*, in the condemnation of Baius, of Molinos, and of Quesnel—they must further teach that the faithful have no means whatever of knowing, which part of the pronouncement is *ex cathedrâ* and which is otherwise. It is plainly impossible, that eminent and approved theologians can have taken up a position so obviously self-contradictory.

We might indefinitely prolong our reply, but have surely said enough. As to the positive ground for that thesis which we have maintained, we have adduced in previous

numbers a sufficient array of reasons. Dr. Murray, in his treatise, has added very many more; and there is a large additional number in reserve, if wanted. Our present object has not been to add any positive argument, but to remove one particular objection.

The case of Galileo has been again and again alleged, as by far the strongest and most irrefragable disproof of our thesis; and we entered on it, therefore, at considerable length. Principally we urged, that there is no pretence whatever for saying that the Pope condemned Copernicanism *ex cathedrâ*; or that even those most opposed to that theory, claimed the congregational decree as infallibly condemning it. To this, the one essential part of our argument, we have as yet heard of no objection.

But the further question, of doctrinal decrees issued by a Pontifical Congregation, is closely connected with the thesis which we had been treating; and it is one of much importance at the present time: for which reasons we thought it more satisfactory to discuss that question at length. On this portion of our article Mr. Healy Thompson has written some comments in the most friendly spirit;\* and, by considering these comments, we shall be able to express our full meaning on some particulars, more distinctly than we have hitherto done. We do not here speak of those doctrinal decrees, which issue indeed from the Congregations, but which are promulgated by the Pope's special command; because we are disposed to hold, with Zaccaria, that these pronouncements are *ex cathedrâ* (p. 387): and Pius IX.'s words (*ibid.*) seem strongly to support that proposition. Here, then, we are speaking of those doctrinal decrees, which may have received indeed his sanction, but which are not promulgated by his special command; and of which, therefore, no one has ever alleged that he issues them as Universal Teacher.

Now of these, no less than of the others, Pius IX. has infallibly decreed (p. 380), that a Catholic man of science is bound to yield them his interior assent. The first question, then, concerns the *nature* of that assent; which differs in kind, as is axiomatically evident, from that due to an infallible decision. Mr. Thompson speaks of such assent as "provisional"; but the word is, perhaps, somewhat invidious, and, at all events, is calculated to convey a wrong impression. A youth of fourteen years old is being instructed by his father, to whom he has every reason for looking up, in the facts and

---

\* See the *Tablet* of November 4, 1865.

principles of history. He accepts the whole instruction with unqualified assent; nor does the very thought of its being mistaken in any particular so much as enter his mind. It would surely be strange to call this a "provisional" assent; though, if you pressed him with the question, he must reply that his father is not infallible, and that part of the paternal instruction may possibly be mistaken. The assent due from every Catholic to the doctrinal decrees of a Pontifical Congregation is (we maintain) the same in kind, but very far firmer in degree: very far firmer in degree, for the various reasons assigned in pp. 390-392.

It is now admitted on all hands, that the condemnation of Copernicanism was (as one may say) objectively incorrect; that the theory, then declared contrary to the Scriptures, is not really contrary to them. Of this undoubted fact two explanations are possible. The first is, that Paul V. and his advisers simply made a mistake; nor is there any insurmountable difficulty in such a supposition. The youthful son gains immeasurably more of real knowledge by accepting without hesitation the whole of his father's instruction, than he could possibly gain by questioning and sifting it, and believing nothing on his father's authority. In like manner a Catholic would gain far more spiritual knowledge by interiorly accepting all these decrees, than by declining such acceptance; even though it might happen, on certain very rare occasions, that they led him into error.

But, for ourselves, we are most unwilling to admit that any doctrinal guidance is mistaken, which the Pope has put forth as Head of the Church; even though he has not given it in his capacity of Universal Teacher (see p. 422). True, there is no *promise* of such inerrancy; and whenever a clear case of mistake is conclusively established, we will, of course, change our mind. But, at all events, for more than one reason, we thought it very important to point out what we consider unquestionable; viz., that Galileo's condemnation was no mistake at all, in any proper sense of that word.

If a decree is put forth claiming infallibility, it purports to have God's unfailing guarantee of its truth. But it is most certain that Galileo's condemnation was *not* put forth with any claim to infallibility; and we ask, therefore, what such a decree *does* purport to be. No answer but one can possibly be given, as a moment's consideration will evince. It purports to instruct Catholics in that conclusion, which legitimately follows from existing data. Now we argued at much length, that the contrariety of Copernicanism to Scripture *was* the consequence legitimately resulting from the data of 1616.

(See pp. 392-400 ; 406 ; 420.) The reason why Copernicanism is now justly held to be consistent with Scripture, is its having been scientifically established (p. 394) ; but, so far was this from having been the case in Galileo's time, that, on the contrary, as a matter of mere science, its falsehood was more probable than its truth (pp. 399, 400). Nor was Galileo's confidence in the scientific strength of his theory any presumption of its real strength ; because the one main argument, on which he laid his stress, is now admitted by every one to have been absolutely worthless (p. 400). By accident he was right ; but "formally," even as a man of science, he was wrong.

The decree purported to be—not infallibly guaranteed by God, but—the true conclusion from existing data. Well, it *was* the true conclusion from existing data : how, therefore, in any true sense, can it be called mistaken ? On the contrary, it afforded "true doctrinal guidance to contemporary Catholics" (p. 423). For (1) it inculcated on them that doctrinal lesson, which legitimately resulted from existing data ; and (2) it warned them against "a most false, proud, irreverent and dangerous principle of Scriptural interpretation" (p. 417). What is that principle ? "The contradicting the obvious and traditional sense of Scripture, on the strength of a theory scientifically unlikely" (p. 420). And this is a principle as anti-Catholic now as it was then.

Mr. Thompson characterises the case of Galileo as a "very difficult" one ; but we cannot admit that when the facts are rightly apprehended, there is any great difficulty in explaining them. He suggests, however, two solutions of the "difficulty ;" both of which, we must say, appear to us far less satisfactory, than even the simple supposition of the Congregation having made a mistake. His first suggestion is, that "exterior assent and submission was all that was absolutely required." But this is contrary to most manifest facts. Paul V. declared (p. 404) that Copernicanism may "not be defended *nor held ;*" and Galileo was admonished to "depart from," "desist from," and "desert" it (p. 405, *note*). Secondly, Mr. Thompson hints (as we understand him) that at last Copernicanism may turn out to be false. But surely this is to solve one difficulty (if difficulty there were) by substituting another immeasurably greater. Every educated Catholic throughout the world (with exceptions the most insignificant), now holds that tenet, which the Congregation condemned ; Pope and bishops hold it no less than the rest. Nothing then can be more certain, than that the Ecclesia Docens has tacitly reversed the doctrinal decree of 1616 : moreover, if Copernicanism were really contrary to Scripture, it would, of course, be heretical.

We would ask Mr. Thompson, then, which of these two alternatives is the more improbable. Is it more improbable that a tribunal, confessedly fallible, made a mistake? \* or that when a certain heresy more generally prevailed among Christians, the Ecclesia Docens took occasion tacitly to revoke the authoritative condemnation of that heresy? nay, that both Pope and bishops have interiorly accepted it?

Before we were aware of any adverse criticism on our article, we felt that we had not sufficiently explained our meaning, where we had spoken of "true doctrinal guidance being afforded to contemporary Catholics." In answering Mr. Thompson's remarks, however, we have said all which seemed necessary in the way of elucidation.

We may conclude by mentioning, that those astronomers who advocated the Copernican *hypothesis*, as the one most serviceable for advancing their science, not only were never discouraged in Rome, but were more favoured there than their opponents. Our authority for this statement is a very interesting letter addressed, three or four years ago, to the *Tablet* by Prof. Robertson.

---

\* The reader will remember that we do not admit the Congregation to have made any mistake at all.



## Notices of Books.

---

*Prælectiones Theologicae de Virtutibus Fidei, Spei et Charitati.* Auctore  
JO. PERRONE, S. J. in Collegio Romano Studiorum Præfecto. Ratisbonæ,  
1865.

IT was in the year of our Lord 1753, that the "Theologia Moralis" of S. Alphonso Liguori was first given to the world. At that time what is technically called "rigorism" held a decided and settled sway, not only among the French clergy, and the clergy of other lands who had drawn their theological knowledge directly from French sources, but also, to a considerable extent, among the clergy of Italy, of Germany, of Spain, and of other countries. There was a Gallican rigorism; there was a Jansenist rigorism; and there was a rigorism, as that of Antoine, Concina, &c., distinct, in certain important respects, from both. We need hardly say that the Jansenist rigorism was very much the most objectionable of all. There was, moreover, besides the Jansenist and condemned, a milder rigorism, as in Billuart; a sterner rigorism, as in the two authors just named. Alongside the rigorous schools, but also existing before them, there was a "lax" school of moral theology, but far more limited in the number of its teachers and defenders, and still more limited in the extent of its practical influence. In fact, this school may be said to have died out about the close of the seventeenth century. Not so rigorism, which maintained a hard struggle, and ruled a wide, though gradually narrowing, domain, down to a period within the recollection of the present generation. If we bound over one hundred years from the date of 1753, we find rigorism—especially the more extreme rigorism—banished from every, or almost every, theological school in the world. The man who, above all others, had the main part in achieving this mighty and salutary work—the man who may be justly and without any exaggeration called its Apostle, was Alphonso Liguori. We are writing only a notice, and therefore cannot enter into the details of the movement, or do more than name the present Archbishop of Rheims, Cardinal Gousset, as the man who took so leading a part in giving a strong and wide impulse to that movement in France.

What S. Alphonso Liguori achieved for moral theology, in clearing it of rigorism or moral Gallicanism, but only a long time after he had gone to his reward, very much the same has Father Perrone achieved during his own life time for dogmatic theology in purifying it from the already fading taint of dogmatic Gallicanism. He was born in the year 1794, at Chieri, a large manufacturing town, distant about nine miles from Turin. When he had attained his twenty-first year, and after a brilliant course of philosophical and

theological studies in his native country, he set out for Rome, and there entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus, which had just been re-established by Pius VII. At the termination of his noviceship he was sent to the Jesuit College at Orvieto, where he remained for seven years teaching dogmatic and moral theology. In the year 1823 he was recalled to Rome, to fill the chair of dogmatic theology in the Roman College which Leo XII. had in that year restored to the Society. In 1830 he was appointed Rector of the Jesuit College at Ferrara. In 1833 he was again recalled to the Eternal City to resume his former functions. Here, with the exception of the period of the Mazzini reign of terror, he has remained ever since. In 1853 he was relieved from the onerous duties of professor, which he had discharged for about thirty-four years, and appointed Prefect of Studies in the same College—an office which he has held up to this day. It was in 1835 that he commenced the publication of his *Predlections*, which was completed in the course of a few years. This brief sketch of the life of so eminent a personage (which is mainly taken from a biographical notice prefixed to a French translation of one of his later works) would prove, we thought, not altogether uninteresting to our readers.

The *Predlections* have already passed through at least as many editions as years have elapsed since their completion. We believe that we speak the *literal* truth in saying that there is not a theological college of any repute in the whole Church, in which numerous copies of this work are not found in the hands of students and professors. Whatever shortcomings may have been attributed to it by certain critics, there can be no doubt that it had exercised an extent of influence on the schools of Europe, to which we know of no parallel since the days of the great old theologians.

An author cannot be fairly censured for not having accomplished what he has not proposed to accomplish. All that can be justly demanded of him is, that he should propose to himself to do a work that was really needed, and that he should do that work well. Now it is apparent on the face of his *Predlections* that Father Perrone put before himself two important objects to be attained, one of them very important.

In the first place, he has undertaken throughout his work to distinguish carefully the defined doctrines of the Church, together with the sure and unquestionable conclusions of theologians, on one hand, from open questions and free opinions on the other. This, in many departments of dogmatic theology, was not a difficult task, or one to be executed for the first time. But in other departments, neither was the task so easy, nor had it been as yet satisfactorily accomplished. We would instance particularly the treatises on the Incarnation and on Grace—more especially the latter. One who had not tried to master the treatise on Matrimony before the publication of Carriere's larger work on the subject, can have no idea of the numerous perplexities which that great work (great, notwithstanding its serious blunders on certain points) disentangled. One who had not studied the subject of grace before the appearance of F. Perrone's treatise, can have no idea of the immense benefit which it has conferred on theological students, by its clear and accurate separation of the binding from the free, of the certain from the uncertain. We could easily illustrate our position by numerous examples.

The great and indeed most special value of F. Perrone's labours in this line, is the authority with which they come recommended to us. Not only did his work receive the usual *imprimatur* of the Roman censors, but, what appears to us still more decisive, it has been for about a quarter of a century widely and familiarly known in Rome, known to the Roman divines and to the Roman authorities. We may be pretty sure that if anything unsound had appeared in the work, that watchful eye would ere this have detected it, and that unerring finger have marked it out.

In the second place, F. Perrone broke up anew a large part of the field of theological science, with the view of adapting it, not exclusively indeed, but more specially to the definitions of the Church, and to the requirements of the existing as well as of the past age. On the one hand he undertakes to prove and defend, not the dicta of schools (however highly respectable and valuable for other ends), but the doctrines of the Church. Hence his propositions are as much as possible worded in the language of the definitions of Councils. On the other hand, to the exposition and refutation of the heresies of former times, he has added the exposition and refutation of the heresies of his own day, *e.g.*, the speculations of modern Germany (so far as they had appeared at the period of his writing), the Tractarian system in England, &c.

The volume before us (composed, we understand, many years ago) is simply a supplement to the "Prelections"—as, indeed, the learned author himself informs us in the preface. It bears so exactly the stamp of his mind and method as displayed in the older production, that the perusal of two or three pages would have revealed the writer to us, even though we had not learned his name from the title-page or from any other source. The book is remarkable throughout for its clearness and precision—two essential, but, we regret to say, far from common requisites of composition, especially in scientific works. Then there is the old *freshness*. In theology there is ample room for a certain species of originality: there may be new arguments, new "wrinkles" put on old arguments, new illustrations, new answers to old as well as to new objections, new methods, new settings of the old diamonds of truth, new speculations radiating from them or circling around them. Still the larger proportion *must* be a reproduction of the old. But there are many ways of reproducing, as there are many ways of singing the same song or delivering the same speech. Some men there are who cannot utter the thoughts of others without diluting and enfeebling them. They resemble that description of persons who can never be made to look genteel: clothe them with a new suit of the finest, and they are still shabby and seedy-looking. Then there are others who have no powers of mental digestion; they cannot assimilate anything; they are mere conduits, and give what they get and as they get it. The worst of it is, that the world is so full of persons belonging to these two classes who are eternally getting and giving, who seem to live only for getting and giving in their respective ways. F. Perrone belongs to a class very different indeed. If there is nothing new to be said on a subject, he says the old thing, but he says it in his own way, and just as if it were all his own. He belongs to that class of men whose minds are full of glancing sunbeams; the thoughts passing through are tinged with their light. If he has to take other men's ideas, he thinks them over again

for himself, and they are given out with the hues of his own mind shining freshly upon them.

We have more—much more—to say, but we are at our paper's end. It would be mere waste of space to present our readers with any details or analysis of a book which will soon make its way into every theological college in Europe. The present writer has never seen F. Perrone's face; but it is testified by a cloud of witnesses that he is as amiable and kindhearted as he is able and learned. If we could presume, we should like to offer a suggestion to him, and that is that he would give the world, not a new reprint, but a new edition of his "*Prælectiones Majores*," with the improvements which the reading and reflection and observation of the many years that have elapsed since their first appearance would suggest to him. We know that others of his admirers share with us in this wish. Whatever may be the value of his numerous other writings, he may rest assured that it is by this work the widest and most enduring good will be effected in after time—by imbuing the minds of theological students, the future teachers of others, with sound principles. We have been glad to learn recently, on the best authority, that he still enjoys unimpaired health of body and vigour of mind; and that he is quite capable therefore of such a task. Whatever the good Father may think of our suggestion, we heartily wish him, in the words of the long consecrated acclamation, *multos annos*.

---

*The Liberty of Teaching Vindicated. Reflections and Proposals on the Subject of Irish National Education.* By ISAAC BUTT. Dublin: Kelly.

THIS little work is excellently reasoned throughout; yet the reasoning is quite a subordinate matter, when considered in comparison with the facts narrated. What will our readers say, *e.g.*, to the circumstance, that the system of education, propounded in the famous letter of Mr. Stanley (now Lord Derby), and fashioned in accordance with the recommendations of the House of Commons Committee,—that this system was never acted on for a single day? That a system, differing from it in its most fundamental principles, was adopted in its stead? Yet this circumstance is incontrovertibly established by Mr. Butt.

Undoubtedly, the only fit method of education, in a country where religious differences unhappily exist, is the strictly denominational method. But though mixed systems are necessarily unsatisfactory, we readily admit that never was there one more thoroughly just and straightforward, than that originally proposed by Mr. Stanley. The combined instruction was to be exclusively "moral and literary;" the system absolutely required that one day at least in every week (apart from Sunday), and by preference two days, should be set apart for denominational religious instruction; while it permitted such instruction on every day, either before or after the ordinary school hours.

"Every one must feel," says Mr. Butt, "that if literary instruction could wholly be separated from religion—if, for instance, the scholars were only to

learn arithmetic, reading, writing, book-keeping, and mathematics—such a system as this made ample and perfect provision for a complete education both literary and religious" (p. 36).

At the time when Mr. Stanley's letter was written, Dr. Whately had just been appointed as Protestant Archbishop of Dublin; he was therefore naturally and properly placed on the Board of Commissioners. From the first he aimed at an object, not only different from, but directly contrary to, that professed by Government. Their avowed, and (we are convinced) their true wish, was to give Irishmen the full benefit of education, without any proselytism, direct or indirect. Dr. Whately, on the contrary, aimed from the first at making the new system an instrument—not, indeed, for converting Catholic children to Protestantism, but for leavening them with what he would call "liberal and enlightened" Catholicism; for lessening their exclusive and "bigoted" attachment to their fathers' creed; and for imbuing them with the poison of latitudinarianism and indifference. With this view a large scheme of united religious instruction was organised. The design was expressed of inculcating on Catholic and Protestant children, jointly, a large body of religious truth, which should avoid clashing with the "peculiarities" of either "denomination."

All sound Catholics, we suppose, looking back on the past at this interval of time, must admit that such a course was in principle indefensible, and must in practice have been most mischievous. And this for two different reasons, to mention no more. Firstly, to train the child as a sound Catholic, is to train him in a firm and practical conviction, that his one appointed guide to religious Truth, the one accredited witness of Divine Revelation, is the Catholic Church. But by Dr. Whately's plan he was taught a large and miscellaneous assemblage of doctrines, which was sanctioned indeed by certain pastors of the Church; yet not sanctioned by them precisely as pastors, deliberating with each other under the authority of the Holy See, but as members of a State Board, deliberating with non-Catholics under the authority of Queen Victoria. Then, secondly, to train the child as a sound Catholic, is to train him in a firm and practical conviction, that the Catholic Faith is the one only road to Heaven; that no non-Catholics whatever can be saved, except in virtue of some portion of that Faith which they retain, while invincibly ignorant of the rest; and that even that portion is most inadequately apprehended by them, from their not possessing those other truths with which it is indissolubly bound up. But under Dr. Whately's auspices he practically imbibed the notion, that a large body of fundamental dogma is common ground, in the fullest sense of that term, between Catholics and Protestants; and that both may stand (as it were) on the same platform in acquiring it.

It was a happy day for Ireland, when Dr. Whately and his friends were driven to resign their seats on the Board. From that time, it would seem from Mr. Butt's account, that Irish government education has been becoming in practice more and more denominational, though the theory of united education is unhappily still retained. All the evils which any opponent can attribute to the former now exist; while the invaluable blessings of which

it may be made the minister, are to a deplorable extent withholden, because of the opposite theory which still remains.

It has been pointed out in this REVIEW (April, 1865, p. 428), that by a certain incredible perverseness, the one point on which the Irish earnestly desire their law to be assimilated with the English, is the one point on which they are made the victims of exceptional legislation. The English receive from the State important help towards denominational education; but to the Irish all such help is persistently refused. "In no country in the world," says Mr. Butt, most truly (Pref., p. viii.)—"not even in the Austrian provinces of Venetia—are national feeling and sentiment so completely excluded from any control over the management of national affairs."

It is greatly to Mr. Butt's honour, as a Protestant, that he shows so much sympathy with the grievance inflicted on Catholics in this whole matter. He will not allow us, however, altogether to forget his heterodoxy; for he introduces at p. 99 an outrageous piece of religious liberalism. With the main drift of his work, however, we must express unqualified sympathy; and we refer our readers to it for a most interesting history of all the successive steps which have been taken in the matter.

---

*The Privilege of Religious Confessions in English Courts of Justice, Considered in a Letter to a Friend.* By EDWARD BADELEY, Esq., M.A., Barrister-at-Law. London: Butterworths.

ONE follows Mr. Badeley's erudite and well-arched argument like a covered way leading, as it were, from the "liberal air" of the present day, under the oppressive mass of anti-Catholic legislation of the last three centuries, out into the clear region of the ancient Catholic common and canon law of England, which S. Edward established, and which so many pious Chancellors, from S. Thomas of Canterbury, to Sir Thomas More, expounded and illustrated. The occasion of the present pamphlet, which is written in the form of a letter to a friend, was the strong declarations made by the late Lord Chancellor and by Lord Chelmsford, last May, in the House of Lords, touching the obligation of a clergyman, whether Protestant or Catholic, to reveal in a court of justice matter confided to him in confession. Mr. Badeley elaborately examines all the legal aspects of this most serious question—in the first place, with a view to the state of the common law at the date of the Reformation; in the second place, with a view to the course of legislation since that period; and in the third place, as to the great authorities upon the nature of evidence.

On the first point, Mr. Badeley, starting from the indisputable position that, in Catholic times, the rule of the Church in such matters, not the rule the State, gives a clear synopsis of the canon law on the subject, showing incidentally, how far it was grafted on our ancient Institutes. Then, by a very ingenious and cogent argument, he maintains that the particular canons and constitutions, which guarantee the sanctity of confession were reserved in full force by the Act 31 Henry VIII., c. 14.



His examination of the different subsequent legal opinions and judgments, and of the commentaries of the great authorities on the law of evidence upon such opinions and judgments, is, however, the most interesting and the most able part of the pamphlet. Every light that can be brought to bear upon the question, whether from precedent or from analogy, is most admirably presented; and the conclusion appears to us, by stress of argument, irrefragably established. "I know not how," he says, in conclusion, "any person can venture to affirm that Confessions are not privileged in courts of justice. Even if statutes and canons had left this privilege doubtful, which I fearlessly maintain that they have not, it exists, as we have seen, by the common law; and therefore the legal maxim would apply to it, '*Quod communi legi derogant, stricte interpretari debent.*'" In a word, if confession is authorised, or permitted, as a religious rite, its secrecy is authorized and permitted also; for without it the rite itself is neutralized, and the rules which sanction it are a dead letter; but as it was well said in another case, "If you make a thing lawful to be done it is lawful in all its consequences." The service which Mr. Badeley has rendered to Catholic law will only be fully felt when the case which he has so elaborately examined in his study comes, as it may any day, to be again thoroughly argued in the courts.

---

*Dishonest Criticism. Some Remarks on two Articles in the Dublin Review for July and October, 1865.* By HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A.  
London: Longmans.

MR. OXENHAM will gain nothing by this pamphlet, unless he counts it gain to throw dust in the eyes of a few thoughtless persons. The question, however, between him and ourselves is now so very much more of personal than of public concern, that we cannot expect our readers in general to study further the controversy. But if there be any who do take an interest in it, and who suppose that in this pamphlet Mr. Oxenham has given the slightest answer to any one of our charges against him, we must ask their attention to what follows. We should not, indeed, think it worth while to express it, if we could only trust that all such readers would take the trouble of carefully examining the question; of considering *seriatim* the various counts of our indictment, and Mr. Oxenham's attempted replies. We will take them in the order of our October article.

1. On the Lord's Prayer. In p. 109 of his volume on the Atonement, the following passage occurs. We print it exactly as it stands:—

"On the Socinian view, the benefits of Christ's Incarnation are necessarily limited to His proclamation of the divine promises, the perfect example of His life, and still more of His death, and his pure utterance of the moral and spiritual law; and they even included in this last His revelation of the Lord's Prayer, forgetting that it was already in use among the Jews. His teaching and example were guaranteed by His death and resurrection, which also gave a pledge of ours, and He is henceforth to be adored as a glorified Man, our King and High Priest in heaven."

At this word "heaven," an asterisk is appended ; and the corresponding asterisk at the foot of the page is followed by the words, "See Möhler's Symbolism, vol. ii. p. 335, *sqq.* (Robertson's translation)."

Here two things are at once obvious. Firstly, no reader would have imagined that Möhler's work is cited as Mr. Oxenham's authority for his statement about the Lord's Prayer, but for his account of the Socinian tenets. Secondly, every one would have understood Mr. Oxenham to mean, by the concluding words of his first sentence, that the Lord's Prayer "was already in use among the Jews" *as a form*. In our July number (pp. 265-8) a correspondent commented on this remark. As to the value of his argument, there may of course be two opinions ; but its *purport* cannot be misunderstood by a schoolboy. It was to this effect : "Various writers have before now said that the Lord's Prayer was almost entirely *derived from Jewish sources* ; though I think such an opinion very mistaken, and give my reasons for thinking so. But Mr. Oxenham seems to hold that the Lord's Prayer was actually *in use* ; 'that the Jews used to repeat their Pater Nosters before our Blessed Lord had taught' \* the prayer. Such a blunder is unprecedented and scandalous." Here, then, two opinions are spoken of, as different from each other as two opinions in the same direction can possibly be : opinion A, "the Lord's Prayer is derived from Jewish sources" ; opinion B, "it was in use as a prayer before our Lord." Our correspondent entirely dissented indeed from opinion A ; but he ascribed to Mr. Oxenham opinion B, and designated it an unprecedented and scandalous blunder. Mr. Oxenham, greatly aggrieved at this, wrote both to the *Tablet* and to ourselves. These letters are printed in our October number, from p. 319 to p. 322 ; and we beg our readers to reperuse them. He complains bitterly of his opinion having been called "scandalous," "careless," "extravagant," and the like ; epithets which our correspondent had most unmistakably applied, not to opinion A, but to opinion B. Nor does he, from beginning to end, while complaining of all else, make the slightest complaint of his meaning having been misunderstood. Of course, therefore, when writing for October, we could have had no doubt whatever that he intended opinion B. It may be added, that the authority to which he appealed was not one or more of those numerous writers who hold opinion A ; but Möhler, of whom he now admits (p. 11, note) that the "German original does seem to favour" opinion B, "though not to require" such an interpretation.

Our astonishment then may be imagined, when we find Mr. Oxenham now disclaiming opinion B, and arguing with much diligence for opinion A ; as though that opinion had been confessedly the point at issue (pp. 9-14). We will say this : If Mr. Oxenham has a clear memory of what he meant, and assures us that he had no intention of expressing opinion B, we will fully credit his statement. But if he has no such clear memory, we shall retain the strongest impression, that his present interpretation of his own words is an unconscious afterthought, into which he has been led by discovering the wild extravagance of his original thesis.

However, we have no wish to carry on an argument as to the greater or

---

\* These were our correspondent's actual words in July.

less degree in which the Lord's Prayer was derived from Jewish sources, or whether any part of it was so derived at all. That opinion, against which we expressed ourselves most earnestly, is now so absolutely repudiated by Mr. Oxenham himself, that he considers himself never to have held it.

2. Next as to his complicity with prop. xiii., condemned in the Syllabus. There can be no second opinion on the sense of this proposition, which runs thus :—"The method and principles by which the ancient scholastics cultivated theology, are not suitable to the necessities of our times, and to the progress of the sciences." And we quoted two passages from Mr. Oxenham's work, as conveying this proposition. One was from his Preface. The italics were ours.

"It is of the last importance that at this supreme crisis of her history, her children should be closely united, and well equipped to meet the coming foe, not with the *blunted or misshapen instruments of a ruder warfare and a coarser age*, but with weapons forged and polished *fresh* in the armoury of wisdom, of justice, and of truth."

Mr. Oxenham (p. 24) denies that he intended any application of this to scholasticism ; and of course we believe him on his word : but we must maintain that we understood his sentence in its one obvious and legitimate sense. Of existing theological weapons, all are "blunted or misshapen instruments," except those which are "forged and polished *fresh*." No one will say that scholasticism has been "forged and polished *fresh*"; it is characterized therefore by our author as a "blunted or misshapen instrument." We never implied that Mr. Oxenham's strictures referred to it *exclusively*,\* but inclusively and prominently.

As to the longer passage, quoted by us at length in pp. 328, 9, the author expresses a passionate conviction of its truth, but does not attempt to draw any distinction between its sense and that of the condemned proposition.† Nor, we believe, is there any reader in the world, candid or uncandid, who will doubt that the passage conveys that proposition.

Further, this condemned proposition is no incidental or subordinate error, but the fundamental tenet of an erroneous system. Dr. Döllinger's whole intellectual view of Christianity is founded on his opinion, that scholasticism is obsolete ; and that a new scientific theology, based on essentially different principles, is among the most urgent necessities of our time. Both the passages above recited convey this opinion, in their one legitimate objective sense. The Holy Father from the first has manifested the most earnest disapproval of the tenet ; but in the Syllabus he has condemned it with a clearness, which precludes all power of evasion.

In company with the large majority of Catholics, we regard such condemnations as infallibly just. Mr. Oxenham may think otherwise, without

\* His words, we said, "contain a great deal more than this" (p. 329).

† These are his words (p. 27) : "To say that [the passage] contradicts a Papal Encyclical, is to insult the authority from which the Encyclical emanates." We did not speak vaguely of "a Papal Encyclical," but of one most definite proposition, which the Church has condemned. This Mr. Oxenham evades.

actually ceasing to be a Catholic ; though not without forfeiting his character for theological soundness. But considering how the bishops throughout the world have accepted the Syllabus, and how the Cardinal Vicar of Rome speaks of it when addressing pastorally the Pope's own diocese under the Pope's own eye, to call our "views" on the matter "peculiar" (p. 22) is as unmeaning as it would be to call them quadrilateral or yellow.

The author asks us (p. 37) whether we should venture to maintain that the Apostles knew "the infallibility of Encyclicals ;" whereas to us it is a matter of unfeigned surprise, how any Catholic can doubt that they knew it. That S. Peter's successor, indeed, would choose the particular *form* of an Encyclical and Syllabus for conveying doctrinal instruction,—they could not know. But the essential is this. The Holy See condemns certain errors, and the whole Catholic Episcopate accepts the condemnation. There are a few Catholics, however, who think that they are at liberty to embrace these errors ; because the Church has condemned them, not as heretical, but as meriting some lower censure. The only nescience we can ascribe to the Apostles on such a matter is this. Most probably, it never occurred to any one of them as even imaginable, that among members of the Church in future ages an opinion would ever be found, so indocile, so disloyal, and so unreasonable.

But let us make the extravagant supposition, that the Pope's solemn condemnation, accepted by the Episcopate, is not infallible : is it, therefore, entitled to no weight over Mr. Oxenham's convictions ? Is not the *Ecclesia Docens*, at all events, immeasurably likelier to be right than he ?

"But even this is not all," we said in October (p. 330). "No Catholic can be so shameless as to say, that so solemn a pronouncement has no significance whatever ; that the Pope's spiritual children may proceed, both in thought and act, just as though it had never been issued. Consequently, even the most disloyal admit in theory that it binds to 'respectful silence ;' that no one is at liberty openly to contradict it. Yet this, and no less, is what Mr. Oxenham has done. He has treated this solemn instruction of the whole *Ecclesia Docens* as though it did not exist ; as an empty breath ; as an unmeaning impertinence."

3. In pp. 330-331, we expressed what seemed to us the upshot of Mr. Oxenham's whole view in this particular. He has most singularly understood us to mean, that we intended this to be the analysis of one single passage, as it stands in his book ; and he gravely assures his readers (p. 26) that he never said anything in that passage to the disparagement of his spiritual teachers, or of the Council of Trent. Surely there can be no reader, for whose sake it is necessary to rectify so strange a misapprehension. What we intended to express, was not an analysis of one passage ; but the drift and bearing of the two passages we had cited, when taken in connection with certain notorious facts. We are quite confident that the comment, of which Mr. Oxenham complains, was not overstated in any one particular. Nor could our readers be led by it into any misapprehension of what the author had actually written ; because we quoted at full length the two passages on which our remarks were based.

4. As to the treatise on development, our original comment was this :—

"In regard to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity—the Trinity, &c. &c.

the Incarnation, the Real Presence, Original Sin, Divine Grace—two propositions are firmly held by every Catholic. (1.) The Apostles, having received their knowledge of these doctrines by immediate inspiration, apprehended them with immeasurably greater fulness and keenness, than are obtainable by an ordinary uninspired Catholic of that or of any later period. (2.) The *Ecclesia Docens* has in every age taught these doctrines truly and adequately to the Christian flock. But (3) there is another proposition, equally certain, and plain indeed on the very surface of history; viz., that the scientific analysis of dogma has been ever increasing in accuracy and fulness, through the labour of theologians and the Church's definitions. To elaborate a theory, which shall include and harmonise these three propositions, without being otherwise at variance with the Church's teaching, with reason, or with facts,—this would be to confer a great benefit on theological study. We opened Mr. Oxenham's introduction, expecting to find the attempt at least to draw out such a theory; but we were greatly disappointed. He simply ignores the two former of the three propositions; or in other words, while professing to solve a problem, he resorts in fact to the simple expedient of shirking its one difficulty."

We illustrated this criticism in October (p. 336), by his language on the ante-Nicene Catholics. He ascribes to S. Justin Martyr an opinion which (as we observed) is virtually Arian; while of two other Catholics he says, that their "language sounds thoroughly Sabellian." Well, but was S. Justin *really* an Arian? were Athenagoras and Theophilus *really* Sabellians? were these heresies *really* tolerated by the Ante-Nicene Church? *This is the one difficulty*, which his subject absolutely required him to answer; whereas, not only he gives no hint for its solution, but he does not exhibit any sense that a solution is required. Does he mean by "development" some principle consistent with the supposition, that the Ante-Nicene Church numbered Arians and Sabellians among her members, nay, among her Saints? or does he mean by it some principle fundamentally different from this? It is bad enough that he writes on so momentous a question, without showing any knowledge of what are the real problems to be solved, or the real data on which a Catholic's inquiry must proceed. But this is not the worst. He writes on development, and gives his readers no means of even guessing what he means by that term. He says, indeed (p. 37), that we "have not condescended to notice his way of explaining it:" whereas we have most distinctly alleged throughout, that he has not explained it at all. If he proceeds on similar methods, he will be writing a treatise on Predestination, which shall contain no reference to man's free will; or a treatise on the Blessed Trinity, which shall ignore the Divine Unity.

It will have been seen, that there are two fundamental verities which we accused the author of ignoring. On the latter of these we can find no tangible reply whatever in this pamphlet. On the former—the fulness of Apostolic knowledge—he answers (p. 32), that "the whole question" of inspiration "in its bearing on development . . . refers . . . not at all to the fulness of Apostolic knowledge, but to the manner and degree of their communicating that knowledge, and its apprehension by those whom they addressed." Of course it does: this, and no other, is the very difficulty which we urged. If the fulness of Apostolic knowledge be admitted, we asked (October, p. 333), "how can we account for the fact, if fact it be, that those who were

taught immediately by the Apostles, knew so much less of dogma than Catholics know at the present day?" How can it be true, as Mr. Oxenham thinks (pp. 32-3), that Catholics of this day "have a keener perception of dogma" than had S. Timothy or S. Titus, considering that these holy men were imbued with Christian doctrine, and moulded in their whole spiritual life, by an inspired Apostle? We have stated this difficulty often enough: perhaps, when Mr. Oxenham next writes on development, he will think of setting himself to solve it.

As to the extracts from his volume, by which we supported our statements, his various answers to our criticism are quite curiosities. We have already referred to his language about ante-Nicene Catholics: he replies to our comment, that Bull met "with very indifferent success" in answering Petavius (p. 35). *Quid ad rem?* By all means let Mr. Oxenham, if he will, follow that truly illustrious theologian, Petavius. But does he? Petavius says of the three Catholic writers in question, that "holding the substance itself of [Catholic] dogma, in certain consequences, they somewhat deflect from the [Catholic] Rule" (de Trinitate, præf. c. 1, n. 12). It is Petavius's distinct judgment, then, that they were not *really* Arian or Sabellian. Mr. Oxenham has nowhere implied this definite account of them; nor has he given his less learned readers any means of guessing, that Petavius so distinctly expressed it.

In October (p. 335), we made another extract from his Introduction, and beg our readers to re-peruse it. Our argument was this. The author holds, that those who expected Christ's speedy return, had no room left for the doctrine of Purgatory to occupy their thoughts; and he also holds, that S. Paul expected Christ's speedy return. From this, it immediately follows that S. Paul knew not of Purgatory; and that he "knew less than we do, what immediately became of" his disciples who died in a state of grace. This is one startling paradox; and Mr. Oxenham leaves it untouched. But further, if S. Paul knew nothing of Purgatory, how can he have spoken of it—as the author expressly says that he did—as of "the fire that should try every man's work"? The author replies (p. 34), that he need not "discuss" "how far S. Paul apprehended the full meaning of his own words."

In p. 336, we made another extract, for the purpose of asking an obvious question; which the author, however, does not attempt to answer. He replies in effect (p. 35)—if, indeed, he makes any reply at all—that our exclamation, "Good God!" was too strong for the occasion. We cannot think that it was at all too strong for the occasion.

To our comment on the other extracts which we cited, Mr. Oxenham makes no reply at all. With one exception, however.

5. In our original notice, we said (p. 269), that "his language would give as much warrant" for maintaining that he denied, instead of merely ignoring, the fulness of Apostolic knowledge. And we quoted a sentence of which, as it seemed to us, "there was but one obvious meaning: viz., that the knowledge of dogma possessed by S. Peter or S. Paul was as inferior in its reach to that attainable by Mr. Oxenham or by the writer of this notice, as the size of an acorn is inferior to the size of an oak; and as the extent of mathematical axioms is inferior to the whole extent of mathematical science."



In his letter to the *Tablet* (see our October number, p. 322), he particularly referred to this allegation. Did he reply that we had totally misunderstood his meaning? that he was not referring to the *Apostles'* knowledge of dogma, but to something quite different? Not a word or a hint of the kind: he merely said that his "simile" was "obvious as soon as stated to any one who accepts the theory of development at all." But in this pamphlet he makes an entirely new and most unexpected defence. His original passage, he assures us (p. 16), "does not contain a vestige of the one meaning" which alone we could see in it; and refers not "to what the Apostles knew, but to what they expressed." \* Every reader will have observed, that the proper time for this disclaimer was in July; for in July he expressly noticed our criticism on this simile, and did not disclaim the meaning which we assigned to it. We say here what we have already said on another matter. If Mr. Oxenham assures us, on the strength of a distinct memory, that he did not use his original language in the sense we supposed, we unfeignedly believe him; but if he has no such distinct memory, we cannot but infer that this new interpretation is an unconscious afterthought.

Even according to its present explanation, the simile is portentous. The knowledge of dogma, it appears, taught by the Apostles to their disciples, was as inferior in its reach to that attainable by a modern Catholic, as the size of an acorn is inferior to the size of an oak, and as the extent of mathematical axioms is inferior to the whole extent of mathematical science!

6. We still think as strongly as we did, that "the whole plan of Mr. Oxenham's work is simply absurd and unmeaning," from his having omitted all consideration of the Apostles' teaching on the Atonement. We have no space, however, for continuing the controversy; nor is there any need of our doing so. We cannot doubt of the result, if any ordinarily candid reader will compare our remarks in pp. 339-341 with the author's reply in pp. 19-21.

Here, however (p. 18), he carries the war into his enemy's country; and accuses us on our side of having uttered a proposition, which might not unreasonably be called heretical. We do not "mean" the heretical thesis, he confesses, but we express it. What is his ground? "All later statements of doctrine," we had said, "were developed from the original Apostolic statements;" "and the context," he adds, "proves that" we were "referring exclusively to" their statements in *Scripture*. On the contrary, the context proves that we were not referring to Scriptural statements, as such, even inclusively; that what we meant by "Apostolic statements," was exclusively the oral teaching given by the Apostles to their immediate disciples.†

\* These last are the words of Mr. Oxenham's defender in the *Tablet*, to whom he refers (p. 16) with agreement.

† Mr. Oxenham's accusation, however, has led us more carefully to examine our original passage; and we observe with much regret that the sentence, immediately preceding that adduced by him, is ambiguously expressed. We will quote that and the previous sentence; adding within brackets the words necessary to express our thought distinctly.

"The first step in the history of any doctrine must be an investigation of the particular form in which the Apostles taught that doctrine to their

7. Mr. Oxenham has called our criticism "dishonest," and made, indeed, such "dishonesty" the main staple of his pamphlet; explaining, however, more than once, that he considers our dishonesty "unconscious." Of this unconscious dishonesty—over and above one or two allegations to which we have already replied—we can find but one tangible instance adduced by him, viz., the omission of Dr. Dollinger's name in our original notice. To this moment we cannot imagine what injury Mr. Oxenham even fancies himself to have received from the omission. He cannot possibly mean that we desired to throw any veil over whatever agreement of opinion exists between himself and Dr. Dollinger. What then is his complaint? He had said in effect: "I thoroughly agree with Dr. Dollinger in holding such a proposition;" and we represented Mr. Oxenham as himself holding that proposition. "A procedure more emphatically dishonest," comments Mr. Oxenham (p. 16), "it is difficult to conceive." In so strange a remark, ordinary readers will but see another instance of a characteristic, exhibited in every page, both of this pamphlet and of the author's earlier letters. That characteristic is, that he is more sensitive to unfavourable criticism than any other living writer; and that when his theological competence and intellectual ability are called into question, he seems smitten with a total incapacity for seeing facts as they really are.

---

*The Union Review* for November, 1865. London: Hayes.

THIS number carries on two details of theological controversy with the DUBLIN REVIEW. These we must not omit to notice: further comment on the number we are unwillingly obliged, through want of room, to hold over for our next number.

The *Union Review* has preposterously ascribed to us a certain exaggeration of Ultramontanism, because, in accordance with the immense majority of theologians, we think the Holy Father infallible, not only in his definitions of faith, but in all the doctrinal instructions which he issues *ex cathedra*. In its September number (p. 497, note) it alleged as "a reductio ad absurdum of the DUBLIN's theory" a certain Papal Brief on the "Tradition of the Instruments," which on our view would be infallible, but which, if once so

---

immediate disciples; and any attempt at its historical treatment, proceeding on some other basis, is, *ipso facto*, 'absurd and unmeaning.' But [as regards this particular doctrine of the Atonement] the New Testament, if rightly studied, furnishes abundant materials for obtaining the desired information; such a study, therefore, of the New Testament was the only legitimate basis of Mr. Oxenham's work" (p. 340).

It will be plain to any candid reader, that the words within brackets were understood; but undoubtedly they were not expressed. We much regret that the passage was not more accurately worded; and beg to disavow explicitly the opinion, that on every doctrine Scripture would furnish us with sufficient evidence of the Apostles' oral teaching. As to the doctrine of the Atonement, however, no one will doubt that the New Testament, carefully studied would furnish abundant materials for obtaining the desired information.

admitted, would lead to consequences the most intolerable. We "hailed with pleasure the attempt, so rare in the *Review*, to meet argument by argument, and not by vituperation" (p. 347, *note*); and we called for the name and circumstances of this most singular Brief. Our astonishment may be imagined, when the Reviewer produces in reply the well-known "Instruction" of Eugenius IV., which is considered infallible, not only by exaggerated Ultramontanes (whoever these may be), not only by all Ultramontanes, but by the Gallicans themselves.\* The Reviewer's objection, then, is not one which Gallicans can take against Ultramontanes, but one which Protestants may urge against the whole body of Catholics. If we here notice it, we do so "*ex abundantia*;" for we really cannot engage to answer, in every number, every Protestant objection which the *Union Review* may have endorsed since our last issue.

The Reviewer had to bring forward, in the terms of our challenge, "a Papal Brief asserting the tradition of the instruments to be essential to valid ordination, in such sense that wherever that ceremony does not exist there is no true Christian ordination." Of course, if it were possible for him to fulfil his undertaking, we should either have to give up the infallibility of such Papal Instructions (in this case, indeed, the Church's infallibility altogether), or find ourselves face to face with the *reductio ad absurdum*, that there are no valid orders in the Eastern Church, united or schismatic; also that those of the West were invalid during several centuries, and consequently must be so now, for want of true bishops in those earlier centuries. In fact, that the whole Church is without validly ordained ministers. To redeem his pledge, and place us in this tempting dilemma, the Reviewer refers us to this decree of Eugenius IV. Now the Pope undoubtedly therein says "that in the ordination of priests tradition of the instruments is the matter of the sacrament." But the *Union Review* has committed itself to proving that he says this, "in such sense that wherever this ceremony does not exist there is no true Christian ordination."

We must, of course, believe that the Reviewer thinks this to have been the Pope's meaning; for otherwise his instance would prove nothing. But the Pope does not say so, and we had a right therefore to expect that our opponent would have given us some proof that it was so. It would be impossible to imagine more favourable circumstances, for ascertaining if this really were the meaning of the clause. The tradition of the instruments does not enter into the Greek rite of ordination. The Pope had been, during nearly a year and a half, in constant intercourse with the Greek bishops at Ferrara and Florence, discussing all those points of difference between the East and West which stood in the way of union. Only three months before the date of this decree for the Armenians, all those essential points having been arranged, the long-desired Act of Union had been accomplished. Surely, then, it

---

\* Tourneley is quite a representative Gallican. He says (1) that this Instruction must be "considered as confirmed in the name of the whole Council" of Florence; and (2) that even were the case otherwise, "it should obtain force and authority with all Catholics, especially since it was confirmed and approved by accession of the consent of the whole Church."—*De Ordine*, q. 3, concl. 1.

must be possible, by examining the history and acts of the Council, to find some pretty clear signs of the Pontiff's meaning—some indication that he either held, or did not hold, the Greek rite of ordination invalid, as not including tradition of the instruments. Had the Reviewer taken this course, he would have perceived that he could not have chosen a more unfortunate instance on which to rest his argument, than the Instruction of Eugenius IV. The Greek bishops had been eighteen months among the Latins; they had celebrated at their altars; they had administered sacraments; their priestly and episcopal character had never been called in question. Every essential difference was freely and unhesitatingly discussed. The *Union* will hardly say that the existence or non-existence of a Christian priesthood throughout the entire East was a secondary question; yet during the entire proceedings of the Council no allusion even is made to any insufficiency in the Greek rite. Even after the Act of Union a conference was held, in which the Greeks were called upon to explain many of their usages; and the questions of the Latins show a minute acquaintance with the peculiarities of the Greek rites: yet no question was raised about the Sacrament of Order.

Nothing then can be clearer or more certain, than that Eugenius IV., with the whole West, fully believed the validity of Greek ordination: that is, in other words, did not consider "that wherever the tradition of the instruments is wanting, there is no true Christian ordination."

Two points remain, of which we may be expected to take notice. "Why," asks the *Union Review*, "is no saving clause added in the Instruction, to say that the Greek rite is valid?" We answer that the absence of such saving clause is not peculiar to the Sacrament of Order. Pope Eugenius knew that the Greek and Latin rites differed also in the form of Confirmation, Penance, and Extreme Unction. Yet in the Instruction to the Armenians, he makes no allusion to the Greek rite of those Sacraments.

The explanation is very simple. The Pope was not drawing up a complete and exhaustive treatise on the Sacraments. He himself, in the body of the decree, declares his intention to be "ut sub quodam brevi compendio, orthodoxæ fidei veritatem traderemus;" and again, "*Ecclesiasticorum Sacramentorum veritatem . . . sub hæc brevissimâ redigimus formulâ.*" It was hardly to be expected that a "*brevissima formula*" of instruction, and that, too, published for a special occasion and for a practical end—namely, the union of the Armenians with the Latin Church, and their instruction in the rite they were going to adopt,—should enter into the specialties of the Greek Euchologia, which were nothing to the purpose in hand.

The other point on which it may be well to say a few words, is the *theory* of these diversities in the matter and form of the Sacraments in East and West. Passing, therefore, over other views on the subject, we will give that which seems to us the most satisfactory.

There is no question that the matter and form of all the Sacraments was instituted by our Lord; and that, whilst the Church has full power to prescribe or to vary such ceremonies and observances as she judges good, according to time, place, and circumstances, yet she can only do so, "*salvâ eorum substantiâ.*" It is, however, the opinion of a very large number of theologians, that this determination of the matter and form of the Sacraments

by our Lord was not in the same way or degree for all of them. In Baptism the form admits of more latitude than in the Holy Eucharist; in Extreme Unction than in Baptism. In the Sacrament of Matrimony any form suffices, whether it consist of words or signs, which will serve for a valid contract. According, then, to this theory, with regard to the Sacrament of Order, our Lord determined only that the matter should consist of some sensible sign, sufficiently significative of the power conferred; whilst He authorized the Church to determine, whether by decree or by permitted custom, what *in specie* that external sign should be: and of course she might thus vary it according to time and place. This theory is supported by S. Bonaventure, Alexander Alensis, De Lugo, Suarez, Viva, the Salmanticenses, Morinus, Croix Holzmann, Billuart, Antoine, and many other theologians, and Bellarmine calls it "credible."

Our second controversy with the *Union Review* refers to the Florentine decree on Papal supremacy; which we alleged that the reviewer had represented "as conveying a doctrine, which most assuredly, so far from being Florentine, is one of those very errors which the Council implicitly condemned." To avoid needless repetition, we refer our readers to p. 537-8 of our last number. It will be seen that we there gave three reasons against our opponent's version of the decree, either of which, if valid, would be decisive. He avoids all reference, even the most distant, to the two latter of these; while even as to the first (see p. 686-7) his reply only purports to prove, not that his version is the true one, but only that, so far as words go, it *may* be. Then by a most curious logical process, having proved to his own satisfaction this extremely small conclusion, he assumes at once a triumphant air, as though he had established his own interpretation and demolished ours.

It so happens, however, that he is no less hopelessly in the wrong as regards that argument of ours which he notices, than he is as regards the other two which he has prudently ignored. His whole reply rests on the allegation, that the "continetur" of the Latin does not for certain correctly represent the "*διαλαμβάνεται*" of the Greek; but that the latter may signify "determined," or "settled," in the sense of "appointed," "prescribed." Let us first, then, consider this question as a mere matter of criticism, apart from the intrinsic authority belonging to the Latin version. And we observe at starting that Bossuet, no less than our opponent, had a certain controversial interest in explaining away (what we must maintain to be) the one indubitable sense of the decree; and yet that even Bossuet did not venture to quarrel with the word "continetur."\* Indeed, it would have been very strange if he *had* suggested any other rendering of the verb "*διαλαμβάνω*." This verb occurs in the Acts of the Council, so far as we have been able to see, fourteen times, exclusively of the disputed clause. In all these cases the verb retains one and the same idea; it conveys that the matter referred to forms the

---

\* These are Bossuet's words:—"Certum illud [est] congruere Græco textui de verbo ad verbum postremam interpretationem, "secundum eum modum qui et in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur."—*Def. Dec. Cl. Gall.*, vi. 11.

"contents" of a writing or discourse, is "set forth" therein. This is shown by the context, and also by the Latin version.

There is one passage out of the fourteen, we admit, in which the Latin version gives "sancitur" as the rendering of "διαλαμβάνεται." We are convinced, however, that any one who will look at the context will see, that the word is used in this sentence in exactly the same sense as in the thirteen other instances. Its rendering by "sancire" may be accounted for in this way. It really expresses, as in the other passages, that a certain matter is "set forth" or "contained" in a document. It happens, however, that in this particular case the document in question is a decree of the Council of Ephesus; from which it follows that what is "set forth" in it is likewise *de facto* "ordained," "sancitur."\* We find, then, in every instance in which *διαλαμβάνω* occurs, it bears the one meaning "to set forth," "to say," "to contain."

But even if there could be any fair question on the force of this argument, there remains one appeal, which leaves no room for doubt, and that is the Latin text. Bossuet does violence to it, by changing *etiam* into *et*; and De Marca feels the difficulty of his position so clearly, that he is obliged to suggest that *etiam* must have crept into the text by an error. He frankly owns, however, that S. Antoninus, a contemporary of the Council, quotes the decree as it now stands; and at last is driven, by the weakness of his case, to the desperate resource of suggesting that the Greek bishops were deceived; forgetting, not to speak of many other considerations, that several of the most prominent among them were perfect in the use of the Latin tongue.

---

\* The passage in question runs thus: *ἐπειδὴ παρέβη τὸν ὅρον τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ συνόδου, ἐπειδὴ διαλαμβάνεται ἐκείσε, ὅστις προφέρει, κ. τ. λ.*; which we would translate, "Because he had transgressed the decree of the Council of Ephesus, seeing that therein is said, set forth, or contained, 'Whoever, &c.'" Compare, "Εἶτα ἀνεγνώθη τοῦ Κυρίλλου ἡ ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Νεστόριον, ἐν ᾗ διαλαμβάνει ῥήματα τοῦ ἐν Νικαίᾳ συμβόλου."—"Then was read the letter of Cyril to Nestorius in which he sets forth the words of the Creed of Nicæa;" or, "εὗρομεν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ Ἀγίου Μαξίμου ὃς διαλαμβάνει οὕτως;"—"We found the letter of S. Maximus, who sets forth, or writes, or says thus;" or, *εὗρόντες δὲ τὴν πρὸ μικροῦ γραφείσαν αὐτῷ γραφὴν, ἀνέγνωμεν, ταῦτα διαλαμβάνονσαν*—"We found and read the letter shortly before written by him, setting forth, or containing, or saying these things."

We must not, however, shrink from taking due blame on ourselves. We gave to the word a sense, substantially much the same with one of those given it by Liddell and Scott: "to grasp with the mind, believe, think." But the passages to which we have just referred from the Acts themselves, show that its true rendering is another, given by the same lexicographers; viz., to "set out" or "state clearly and distinctly." On either interpretation, the bearing of the definition is precisely the same; but its wording in fact states, not merely (as we had said) that Papal Supremacy is "the accepted doctrine" in Councils and Canons, but that it is the doctrine expressed by them as accepted. On the other hand, none of the citations adduced by our opponent prove at all to our mind that the verb *διαλαμβάνω* has ever been used in Greek as expressing "to appoint" or to "prescribe." At the same time the present writer willingly admits, that on this question of linguistic criticism he spoke far more confidently, than he was justified in speaking by any proficiency in such matters.



Here, however, comes the most curious part of the controversy. We criticised in our last number the quiet way in which our opponent had put aside the Latin. He defends himself by a bold statement, put forth with the calm security of a man of erudition, intimately acquainted with all the details of his subject. He says, "The Latin is well known to be a mere translation of the Greek of Dorotheus (of Mytelene), made by John Matthew Caryophilus, a Cretan, about 150 years afterwards;" and then triumphantly asks, "Does the DUBLIN really mean to say that a late translation can be as trustworthy a guide as the contemporaneous original from which it was made?"

We were for a short time completely bewildered by this paragraph. There is something in a confident statement and circumstantial details, capable of staggering for a moment one's belief in one's clearest recollections. We had thought it was "well known" that the Decree of Union was drawn up in Latin and Greek; published in the Council in Latin and Greek; and signed in the united Latin and Greek, by the Pope, the Emperor, and the Bishops. The words of the Acts which immediately precede the Decree are, "And when the holy sacrifice had been offered and the Litanies sung, the Definition was recited in *Latin and Greek*—in Latin by the Cardinal of Santa Sabina, Julian; and in Greek by Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicæa; in these words." And nearly at the end of the Greek Acts, "But we, on Tuesday, the 21st of July, assembled in the robing-chamber of the Emperor, signed the tomes, for they were five, *written in Latin and in Greek*, which the Latins and Greeks subscribed each on their own side."

Bossuet, in the same place from which we have already quoted, says, "Secondly, this also is certain, that the Greek as well as the Latin was, with the approbation of the Sacred Council, published in the name of Eugenius; and that the Latin, subscribed by Eugenius and the Latins, has this interpretation, *quemadmodum etiam, &c.*" "Id vero," he continues, "ex authentico Concilii Florentini constat, quod, transmissum olim ad Burgundiae Ducem, Philippum Secundum qui 'Bonus' dicebatur, nunc in nobili Bibliotheca Colbertina, Eugenii ac Joannis Imperatoris signis munitum asservatur."

Giustiniani accounts for two more of the five original copies. After giving, from a manuscript in the Vatican Library, a description of the signing of the Definition, which was beautifully written in Latin and Greek, as in a diptych, with a line down the middle, and signed by the Emperor in red ink, and by the other dignitaries in black, he goes on to say, "The above decree for the Greeks is in the Bullarium Romanum under Eugenius, and one of the originals in parchment written in Latin and Greek, and subscribed by the hand of Pope Eugenius and the Cardinals in black, and by that of the Emperor in red characters, I have seen in the Archivium of the Basilica of S. Peter." He then mentions another copy given by Cardinal Julianus Caesarinus to the Republic of Florence, and preserved in a silver coffer in the Chapel of S. Bernard, in the old palace of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and which had been seen by his learned friend Ferdinand Ughelli, Abbot of SS. Vincent and Anastasius at Rome.

And, lastly, in Orsi (*De Rom. Pont. Auct.*, lib. vi. cap. xi.), we find an account, supplied to him by a friend, of all the five original copies. "*Illud certè est mihi exploratè compertum et cognitum, quinque decreti ejusdem*

exemplaria etiamnum superesse, quæ Pontificis, Imperatoris, multorumque Patrum chirographis confirmata sint. Ac priore quidem loco, memorare oportet quod in gazophylacio magni Etruscorum Ducis servatur; altero autem quod visitur in Bibliotheca Fesulana PP. Reformatorum S. Francisci, cujus transumptum quàm accuratissimè exaratum penes me habeo; tertio quod in Colbertinâ, Bossuetio prædicatore ac teste; quarto quod vir clarissimus, et in omni studiorum genere versatissimus, Scipio Maffei nuper Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ dono liberaliter dedit, quodque egomet non ita pridem hisce oculis vidi; quinto denique quod in arce Sancti Angeli exstat. In latino autem horumce omnium textu, sic oppidò verba eadem leguntur, 'Quemadmodum etiam in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris Canonibus continetur.'

But even this is not all. There can be little question that this portion at least of the Decree was originally composed in Latin, and at once translated into Greek. Popoff, to whom our opponent himself referred us as to an authority (September, p. 571, *note*), expressly says, "The Decree was written in Latin by Ambrose Traversari, and translated into Greek by Bessarion" (Neale's Edition, p. 153, *note*). And Orsi: "Those articles concerning which we are now treating, were first written separately by the Latins, and handed to the Greeks for examination, and then, *totidem verbis*, inserted into the Decree. But since it was resolved that the Decree should be published in Greek also, the articles *had to be translated into Greek*."

We confess to some curiosity as to what can have led our opponent into so grave and so unsuspecting an error. Can he have confounded the Decree of Union with the Acts of the Council? Yet even on this supposition, we cannot congratulate him on having been any more fortunate in his researches. It happens that Caryophilus was *not* the first to publish a Latin version of the Acts. A Latin translation of the Council was published by Abrahamus of Crete, "Episcopus Ariensis," as early as 1526, very nearly a hundred years before that of Caryophilus. And surely the writer has no excuse for making a confident statement of this kind, without having consulted such authors as Pagi, or Arcudius, or De Marca, where he would have learned this fact; indeed he might have seen the preface to the version of Abrahamus, if he had looked for it, in his Collection of the Councils.

Our opponent proceeds with droll solemnity to warn us (p. 687-8) against characterizing the Florentine decree as "obsolete," "incomplete," or "self-contradictory;" and begs that we will "count the cost carefully beforehand." As a matter of principle, of course, we should be the last to use language, opposed to every doctrine which we most earnestly advocate. But what *temptation* can we have to such a course? It is Unionists or Gallicans, not Ultramontanes, who are embarrassed by that most lucid exposition of Papal prerogatives which the Council issued. Were the Florentine Decree accepted by all Catholics in its one straightforward and legitimate sense, every form of Gallicanism would be expelled from within the Church.

In those earnest appeals, then, for Christian unity, which were quoted in the *Union Review* (September, p. 570-572), Eugenius IV. was expressing his intense desire that the Eastern schismatics would once more submit themselves to the Supreme Pontiff. See our remarks in October, p. 538.

"Someday," now adds our opponent (p. 688), "I may produce a catena of large-hearted, peace-loving Popes, who have used similar language." The task which he contemplates is certainly easy enough; but is it not superfluous? Is there any one in the world, Catholic, Protestant, or Infidel, who doubts that the Holy See in every age is most solicitous for the return of heretics and schismatics into the bosom of the Church? Our opponent mentions this REVIEW in the same connection: does he suppose then that its writers and its editor are not keenly desirous of so blessed a consummation?

In conclusion, our readers may be interested to see the Florentine definition of Papal authority in that original Latin, which, together with its accompanying Greek translation, received the signature of Eugenius IV:—

"Item diffinimus sanctam Apostolicam sedem, et Romanum Pontificem, in universum orbem tenere primatum; et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis Apostolorum; et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernand universalem ecclesiam à Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur."\*

*The Valley of Tears. A Poem.* By JOHN CROKER BARROW, M. A.  
London: Longmans, Green, & Co.

"**THE** Valley of Tears" is a history of the journey of a soul through a number of phases of indifference, doubt, hesitation, inquiry, investigation, experience, trouble, deepest grief, all but despair, into the full light of Faith, the blessed life of Charity, and the patience of Hope. It is remarkable as a poem, for the quaint simplicity of its construction, its singular truthfulness, the full-hearted fervour with which it gives expression to feelings which are rarely put into such candid words as these; while, as a page from the story of human experience, it has deep and serious interest. The faults of the poem constitute some of the merits of the spiritual study; thus, a rather trite statement of the objects which principally attracted the writer, while studying the sculptured details of a Gothic cathedral, and which is a recapitulation of the events narrated in the Pentateuch,—is the least poetical portion of the poem, but is most effective in its revelation how the soul of the observer climbed, step by step, towards the comprehension of the purpose of God in His Creation. The first section, which we may call the

---

\* In our last number, among thirty mis-statements which had been made by the *Union Review* in an article of nine pages, we included (p. 347) its proposition that the Douay translation of Scripture "is so notoriously unreliable, that it is seldom read at all." The editor now explains that the word "unreliable" was a misprint for "unreadable;" and we are bound, in justice to him, to acquaint our readers with the fact. Even so, the statement is altogether incorrect, though of course by no means so monstrously so as that accidentally printed.

first stage of this momentous journey, is full of poetical beauties, and has much of the vague charm with which the haunting discontent of the soul, dimly feeling its immortality, rather as a burthen than a privilege, invests self-commune. Lines full of truth and beauty might be selected from this first section, almost at random. Thus we take the following :—

“I used to wonder, full of sighs,  
How soon the dead forgot the ties  
That bound them to the world,  
And why they never could return ;  
And why, within their silent eyes,  
Through lashes all unfurled,  
No life or spirit seemed to burn ;  
And when among their graves I trod,  
I used to wonder, as I walked,  
If they could tell me, who was God,  
The God of whom the grave-stones talked.”

The various phases which this great need assumed, the vain search, in nature, in intellect, in sects, are described with much truth and power, and the first section closes with the following lines :—

“Thenceforward, like a thirst, there stole  
A restless longing on my soul,  
A longing to know more of God,  
And ever, as I urged my feet  
Along the pleasant path I trod,  
That path, in spite of doubt, so sweet,  
I longed that God of mine to meet,  
To cast my life, with all its charms,  
Into his love-extended arms.”

The poet learns how, he tells us in forcible and sweet numbers, to cast his life, with all its charms and griefs, all its joys and temptations, into those arms at last. In the bosom of the one true Church he finds his rest for Time and Eternity. The story would have been interesting and impressive in any form ; as a poem, it is touching, and purely, simply beautiful.

---

*The Life of Saint Teresa, of the Order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.* Edited with a Preface by HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. London : Hurst & Blackett. 1865.

THE biography of a great Saint is the history of the dealings of God with an individual soul, chosen at a particular epoch to work out in a special and extraordinary manner the Divine purpose. The more this purpose is brought out in the biography of the Saint, the truer to life will the portraiture be, for the will of God is the real mould of His Saints. S. Teresa, the contemporary of S. Ignatius Loyola, of S. Francis Xavier, and of S. Philip Neri, was a link in the great chain of Saints with which God drew the heathen as well as the Christian world closer to Himself, at a time when a

mighty evil had severed the bonds of Christian unity. "In opposition to the great Protestant delusion," says the author of this *Life of S. Teresa*, "God raised up two instruments, most unequal according to man's judgment, to cope with the gigantic powers of Luther. They were, indeed, like him, endowed with extraordinary intellectual gifts; yet what power but His who sent David to fight against Goliath with a shepherd's sling and stone, could have enabled a Spanish soldier and a Spanish woman to cope with the apostate and learned theologian of Wittenburg?" Thus, at once, in the introduction to this *Life*, the Divine work to which S. Teresa, like S. Ignatius, was called, is clearly indicated.

In the Saints we see the reflected image of God; their lives, therefore, can never be out of date; yet there are some types of Saints more specially adapted than others for particular periods or needs of the Church. The *Life of S. Teresa*, so singularly supernatural in its character, and so visibly under the Divine direction of our Lord, is a revelation of the direct interposition of God in the guidance of men, which cannot fail to be of greatest service to an age which in its pride of intellect denies the Divinity of Christ, and limits the free agency of the Almighty.

To meet the growing "naturalism" of the age, to impress upon the world the supernatural character of God's dealings with His creatures, we know of no work of its kind better adapted than the *Life of S. Teresa*, which has just appeared under the editorship of the Archbishop of Westminster. Many excellencies combine in this book to give it a peculiar effectiveness. In the first place, the supernatural character of the Saint is clearly brought out, and with such simplicity and truthfulness as alone beseeem the description of the mysterious dealings of God with His favoured servants. The author carefully and successfully avoids the two extremes, too often found in works on hagiology—the painful and exaggerated straining after effect, and the, perhaps, still more common weakness of eclipsing the brightness and veiling the supernatural glories of the Saint's life.

The biographer of S. Teresa has made a skilful and judicious use of the copious materials to be found in the works of the Saint herself, and has allowed S. Teresa as often as possible, and especially in the mystical portions of her life, to speak for herself, and show not only her own acts but the motives which prompted, or, more correctly speaking, the Divine inspirations which set her will in motion. The *Life of S. Teresa* is crowded with events of the supernatural as well as of the natural order, and the writer of her biography marshals them with dramatic effect. There are no superfluous reflections—nothing to interfere with the action of the life, or to interrupt the interest of the reader. The life of S. Teresa is, indeed, a vast drama, in which heaven and earth are seen to approach one another, and the natural and supernatural mingle together; for the veil which divides the seen from the unseen was partially withdrawn, and devils and the souls of men in danger, and rescuing angels, and the sacred Humanity itself, were revealed in visions and raptures to the soul of the Saint. But S. Teresa, as the author observes, was the Saint of common sense as well as a great mystical teacher in the Church. It was the combination in so high a degree of the contemplative and the practical which made the great Saint so effectual an instrument

in the hands of God for the fulfilment of His purpose. Her mystical life was a long and supernaturally-ordered preparation for her many years of active work in the reform of the Order of Mount Carmel—a work so fruitful in results, so conducive to the honour of God and to the welfare of the Church, as even to rival that of S. Ignatius himself.

One of the merits of this biography is the manner in which the character of S. Teresa, in its twofold capacity, is portrayed so as to maintain her complete identity throughout ; for S. Teresa, in the solitude of the cloister, passing out of one ecstasy into another, dreading and doubting in turns the reality of her visions, humble and yet eager, seeking advice and consolation from her spiritual directors, yet finding her chief guidance and only joy in the supernatural directions vouchsafed to her, is the same impetuous S. Teresa as is shown to us in active life, seeking advice in her conflicts with the opponents of her projected reform of her order from holy but most impracticable and tiresome of men, like Don Francis Salcedo and Master Dazu ; trying one after another ; seeking counsel from S. Peter Alcantara, and yet never wearying in searching out the most complete information or the most perfect advice ; recollected in God under all rebuffs, bearing about her the pains of the cross, submissive, patient, docile, yet impelled by natural energy, and burning with divine zeal to do her God-appointed work. Wherever she was, and whatever she did ; suffering in the cloister the most terrible of spiritual trials, or exposed in her active life to the hard judgments of men, and to what was far harder to bear, as S. Peter Alcantara told her—the contradictions of the good,—S. Teresa lived alone for God and in God.

Such a supernatural life as S. Teresa's was from beginning to end, is no easy task to describe ; but in the biography before us a vivid impression is imparted to the mind of the reader : he seems to hear the echo of the voice, and to catch a glimpse of the glories of the saint. This vivid impression, no doubt, in a great degree is owing to the numerous letters of S. Teresa, to her own written statements and reported conversations ; but to possess copious materials of the highest interest is one thing, and to make good use of them is another. It is all the difference between a good biography and a good biography spoilt. The cultivated taste and judgment of the biographer of S. Teresa has, however, produced a work which cannot fail to be of general interest, as it is a simple and faithful record of the interior as well as of the active life of a singularly gifted woman, one of the most wonderful of the saints of the Catholic Church.

---

*The Month* : Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. July—December, 1865.

**I**N the last half-year this periodical has increased its size, enlarged its plan, and taken altogether a vast stride forward. The light articles are now invariably first-rate ; while its more substantial disquisitions are of great merit, and animated by a most Catholic spirit. We would particularly mention two very powerful notices of Dr. Pusey's recent work, in the November and December numbers. In the latter of these, especially, its



writer shows himself to have grasped the whole of that confused, misty, and ill-arranged volume (in itself no easy task), and turns its argument (as one may say) inside out. This article must have been printed off, before Dr. Pusey's first letter appeared in the *Weekly Register*; and we have no means, therefore, of judging, whether that letter has at all changed the writer's view of Dr. Pusey's general characteristics as a controversialist. On this particular part of his subject, at all events, we do not altogether go along with the writer. Still we are very certain that no criticism of the volume, from a Catholic stand-point, can be true, which is not very unfavourable; and nothing can be more effective and triumphant than its exposure in the "Month."

The first article of the December issue is an interesting discussion on periodical literature, domestic and foreign; and we were a little amused by the suggestion which pervades it, on the advantages possessed by a Monthly over a Quarterly. Whenever we have occasion to write on the same theme, it will be *our* business, of course, to point the opposite moral. But, speaking seriously, we are fully convinced of the writer's general thesis; viz., that each class has its own characteristic advantages, and can render important services which the other may not attempt. For ourselves, we wish we could flatter ourselves that we approach, even commensurably, to our ideal of what a Catholic Quarterly might be. But at all events, we hope that the *Month* and the DUBLIN REVIEW may long continue to labour together, each in its appropriate sphere, for that good cause which, certainly, in these evil days, needs all the defenders it can muster.

---

*A History of the City of Rome: its Structures and Monuments, from its Foundation to the End of the Middle Ages.* By THOMAS H. DYER, LL.D., Author of the article "Rome," in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Ancient Geography; "History of Modern Europe," &c. London: Longmans, Green, & Co.

IN this learned and elaborate book we have a connected history of the City of Rome, such as has not previously existed in the English language, and which will be found valuable and welcome by all students of antiquities, and all visitors to Rome, who desire to understand and feel to the full the meaning of the objects which meet their gaze. The author has imposed no mean task upon himself, and he has executed it strictly and well. He describes the rise, progress, and decline of Rome; the origin and story of its more famous monuments; and, without entering into their political causes, the vicissitudes of the city, either through domestic discord or the attacks of external enemies. He puts forth his purpose and plan very tersely in a brief preface. "Even during the Middle Ages," he says, "ancient Rome, or rather its remains, is principally kept in view: It would have been impossible, within the prescribed limits, to give a description of the modern city, or what may be called Christian, in contradistinction to pagan, Rome. On this head only a few of the principal churches have been noticed,

which, as they date their origin from the time of Constantine I., or shortly after, may be considered to belong as much to the ancient as to the modern city."—The subject is redeemed from technical exclusiveness, and enlivened in interest, in addition to its details being assisted in their effect upon the imagination, and impression upon the memory, by descriptions of some of the more striking scenes of which Rome was the theatre, and allusions to the lives and residences of those "who have adorned it by their genius, or illustrated it by the prominent part which they played in its affairs."

The Introduction is remarkably able and interesting, and is particularly to be admired for the temperate tone in which the author sets forth his divergence of opinion from that of the learned in general, who have agreed to accept as conclusive the utterly fictitious character of the early history of Rome. He states his reasons for believing that there is much more foundation for this early history than is now supposed, that the rejection has been too complete and sweeping, and certainly they are impressive and remarkable, quite sufficiently so to re-open the discussion. He sets them forth without prejudice, and so clearly in the interests of truth, and not of disputation, that it is to be hoped, if they are taken up and the controversy is revived, his tone may be imitated by the disputants.

The book is enriched with numerous notes, copious reference to the authorities studied by the writer, a fine and minute map, and a capital index. It is in all respects a valuable addition to our stores of historical knowledge.

---

*The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World; or, the History, Geography, and Antiquities of Chaldaea, Assyria, Babylon, Media, and Persia.* Collected and Illustrated from Ancient and Modern Sources. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of History in the University of Oxford; late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.

THE third volume of Mr. Rawlinson's valuable and important work includes the histories of Media and Babylon, the third and fourth monarchies. In this instance, to an even more remarkable extent than in the preceding volumes, the author accomplishes the rare and difficult feat of investing a subject, which is in its nature dry and heavy, with attractiveness, by the charm of his style, without depriving it of any of its weight and dignity. Commencing with a rapid picturesque sketch of the geographical position of the vast highland, 3,000 feet above the level of the sea, which lies "along the eastern flank of the great Mesopotamian lowland, crossing round it on the north, and stretching beyond it to the south and south-east," the author proceeds to a thorough description of Media, its physical aspects, its natural products, its cities, its remains, its fauna, and its climate. The character, manners, customs, and arts of the people; their religion, language and writing, history and chronology, are treated with the utmost lucidity, and invested with the deepest interest. By adopting the system of referring to his authorities, and comparing opinions and theories, in the notes, and

so maintaining the unbroken flow of description and narrative in the body of the work, the author effectually avoids encumbering his style, while he perfectly maintains the historical authenticity of the book. The summary of the character, influence, and decline of the Median monarchy, and the substitution of Persia for Media, as the ruling power in Western Asia, with which the first division of this volume concludes, is a masterly composition.

The limits of Babylonia proper, the tract in which the dominant power of the fourth monarchy had its abode, being almost identical with those described by Mr. Rawlinson in his first volume, under the head of Chaldæa, he does not commence his history of the fourth monarchy in the same manner as the preceding, but proceeds to discuss the different authorities relative to the extent of the great Babylonian empire of the seventh century B.C. He gives a brief but most comprehensive account of the chief cities, of the outlying provinces, the physical characteristics of the empire, and its mineral wealth. Religion, art, and commerce, the wonderful fortifications, the world-famous hanging gardens, the splendour and the pride of Babylon the Great, are sketched by a skilful hand, and in a style which exhibits a rare combination of profundity and ease. The author assigns vast importance to the Babylonian empire in the history of civilization, and concludes the volume with the following remarkable passage:—"To Babylonia far more than to Egypt, we owe the art and learning of the Greeks. It was from the East, not from Egypt, that Greece derived her architecture, her sculpture, her science, her philosophy, her mathematical knowledge; in a word, her intellectual life. And Babylon was the source to which the entire stream of eastern civilization may be traced. It is scarcely too much to say that, but for Babylon, real civilization might not even yet have dawned upon the earth; mankind might never have advanced beyond that spurious and false form of it which in Egypt, India, China, Japan, Mexico, and Peru, contented the aspirations of the species."

---

*Lives of Boulton and Watt*: Principally from the Soho MSS. Comprising also a history of the invention and introduction of the Steam-engine.

By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of "Industrial Biography," &c. London: Murray.

THE biographer of the Stephensons is in his element as the biographer of Boulton and Watt. The story of those lives, episodes of magnitude and pathos in that which has been justly styled "the tragedy of invention," has material of interest which might defy the worst, while it affords scope to the best biographer; and Mr. Smiles tells it with feeling, enthusiastic sympathy, and considerable literary skill. The elaborate memoir of Edward, Marquis of Worcester, lately published, is a melancholy commentary upon the difficulties and discouragements which inventive genius has, in all ages, to struggle with; but it is tame beside the story of James Watt, who had no rank or fortune to console him under, but only poverty and sorrow to embitter the long-continued, apparently hopeless strife, in which he ulti-

mately conquered. In some respects James Watt reminds the reader of Josiah Wedgwood, and there is so much external similarity between them as consists in the fact that each was sickly and backward in childhood and youth, and that the apprenticeship of each was deferred, from that cause. Watt lived in a more intellectual atmosphere, and suffered less from absence of sympathy, though the aid of poor Scotch professors could not take a material form. Every step from his apprenticeship to a mathematical instrument-maker, to his discovery of the model of one of the unfortunate Newcomen's fire-engines, an event which decided the bent of his genius, and determined his future career, is made interesting by the clear and realizing style of his biographer; but the narrative gains in attraction at the point at which Watt makes his first great discovery—the "separate condenser." The simple manner in which all important suggestions came to him, the patience with which he utilized them, worked them out, and persevered in improving them under every kind of discouragement and mechanical difficulty, for he could get no workmen but ordinary tinmen and blacksmiths, are most remarkable. The domestic aspect of the picture is also full of interest, and is ably handled by the biographer. When the light dawned at length on the long night of misfortune, and Watt was taken into partnership with Mr. Boulton, the owner of the extensive works near Birmingham, known as the Soho manufactory, money, position, and skilled labour, were at his command, and his invention, properly carried out, rapidly became famous.

Mr. Boulton is quite a secondary personage, in comparison with James Watt; but he is made the most of by Mr. Smiles, and he supplies a good deal of the anecdote with which the book is pleasantly enlivened, and gives occasion for some admirable and welcome sketches of society, late in the last century.

---

*Venerabilis Servi Dei Bartholomæi a Maetylibus Archiepiscopi Bracarenensis, ex Ordine Prædicatorum Compendium Spiritualis Doctrinæ ex Variis Sanctorum Patrum Sententiis Magna ex Parte Collectum Denuo. Edidit DR. JOSEPHUS FESSLER, Episcopus Myssnus, J.P. New York: Charles & Nicolas Benziger. 1864.*

THE Venerable Bartholomew of the Martyrs, Archbishop of Braga, stands in the foremost rank among the illustrious Dominicans of the sixteenth century. He was the disciple of S. Louis Bertrand, and the teacher of S. Charles, to whom he dedicated his treatise, entitled "*Stimulus Pastorum*," which has been lately republished by the editor of the reprint now before us, from whose preface we learn that the great Archbishop of Milan held both these works in such high estimation as to cause them frequently to be read at his table. The "*Compendium Spiritualis Doctrinæ*" consists principally of selections from the ascetical and mystical writings of S. Bernard, S. Bonaventure and Gerson, systematically arranged so as to lead the soul step by step, by the mortification of the passions, the practice of virtues, and the use of the various degrees of mental prayer, to the most intimate union with God. It has been now reprinted by Bishop Fessler, in the hope, as he tells us, "that it will prove very profitable to many readers and especially to priests."

*De Imitatione Sacri Cordis Jesu. Libri Quatuor. Auctore P. J. ARNOLDI, S. J. Superioribus Approbantibus. Editio Emendata. New York : Charles & Nicolas Benziger. 1864.*

WE hope that ere long some father of the Society of Jesus will give us an English version of this most beautiful and spiritual book, which in its depth and simplicity reminds us at every page of the "Imitation" of Thos. à Kempis. To say that it can bear a comparison with a work which is accounted, by the consent of Christendom, to stand second only to Holy Scripture, is the strongest testimony which can be borne to its value, both as a help to devotion and a manual for every stage of the spiritual life.

Of all the books which we have seen on the Devotion to the Sacred Heart, this is in our judgment at once the most solidly practical and the most deeply and fervently devotional, while at the same time it contains a complete and systematic course of instruction on Christian doctrine.

It is divided (like the "Imitation") into four books, consisting of dialogues between the *Disciple* and his Divine Master ; the subject of the first being the purification of the soul ; of the second and third, its illumination by the contemplation of the active and suffering life of Jesus ; of the fourth, its union with Him in the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. To each book is prefixed an introduction, containing directions for its use and warnings against the especial dangers besetting that stage of the spiritual life to which it relates.